

[Foreword](#)

**- Ojai 1945 -**

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[8th Public Talk](#)

[9th Public Talk](#)

[10th Public Talk](#)

**- Ojai 1946 -**

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

**- Madras 1947 -**

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[8th Public Talk](#)

[9th Public Talk](#)

[10th Public Talk](#)

[11th Public Talk](#)

[1st Group Discussion](#)

[2nd Group Discussion](#)

[3rd Group Discussion](#)

[4th Group Discussion](#)

[5th Group Discussion](#)

[6th Group Discussion](#)

[7th Group Discussion](#)

[8th Group Discussion](#)

[9th Group Discussion](#)

[10th Group Discussion](#)

[11th Group Discussion](#)

[12th Group Discussion](#)

[13th Group Discussion](#)

[14th Group Discussion](#)

[15th Group Discussion](#)

[16th Group Discussion](#)

[17th Group Discussion](#)

[18th Group Discussion](#)

[19th Group Discussion](#)

[20th Group Discussion](#)

[21st Group Discussion](#)

[22nd Group Discussion](#)

[23rd Group Discussion](#)

[24th Group Discussion](#)

[25th Group Discussion](#)

[26th Group Discussion](#)

[27th Group Discussion](#)

[28th Group Discussion](#)

[29th Group Discussion](#)

[30th Group Discussion](#)

[31st Group Discussion](#)

[Note For Further Group Discussions](#)

[32nd Group Discussion](#)

[33rd Group Discussion](#)

[34th Group Discussion](#)

[35th Group Discussion](#)

[36th Group Discussion](#)

[37th Group Discussion](#)

[38th Group Discussion](#)

[39th Group Discussion](#)

[40th Group Discussion](#)

[41st Group Discussion](#)

[42nd Group Discussion](#)

[43rd Group Discussion](#)

[44th Group Discussion](#)

[45th Group Discussion](#)

[46th Group Discussion](#)

[47th Group Discussion](#)

[48th Group Discussion](#)

[49th Group Discussion](#)

[50th Group Discussion](#)

[51st Group Discussion](#)

**- Bombay 1948 -**

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[8th Public Talk](#)

[9th Public Talk](#)

[10th Public Talk](#)

[11th Public Talk](#)

[12th Public Talk](#)

**- Madras 1948 -**

[Foreword](#)

[1st Group Discussion](#)

[2nd Group Discussion](#)

[3rd Group Discussion](#)

[4th Group Discussion](#)

[5th Group Discussion](#)

[6th Group Discussion](#)

[7th Group Discussion](#)

[8th Group Discussion](#)

[9th Group Discussion](#)

## **OJAI FOREWORD 1945**

This book of Talks, like our previous publications, contains reports of spontaneous discourses about life and reality, given at different times, and is not intended, therefore, to be read through consecutively or hurriedly as a novel or as a systematized philosophical treatise.

These Talks were written down by me immediately after they were given and later I carefully revised them for publication. Unfortunately, a few individuals, unasked, circulated their own notes of some of these Talks but those reports should in no way be considered authentic or correct. To prevent misrepresentation and maintain the accuracy of these teachings we inform those who may be seriously interested that only the publications of Krishnamurti Writings, Inc., are reliable and authentic.

J. Krishnamurti

## OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 1945

To understand the confusion and misery that exist in ourselves, and so in the world, we must first find clarity within ourselves and this clarity comes about through right thinking. This clarity is not to be organized for it cannot be exchanged with another. Organized group thought becomes dangerous however good it may appear; organized group thought can be used, exploited; group thought ceases to be right thinking, it is merely repetitive. Clarity is essential for without it change and reform merely lead to further confusion. Clarity is not the result of verbal assertion but of intense self-awareness and right thinking. Right thinking is not the outcome of mere cultivation of the intellect, nor is it conformity to pattern, however worthy and noble. Right thinking comes with self-knowledge. Without understanding yourself, you have no basis for thought; without self-knowledge what you think is not true.

You and the world are not two different entities with separate problems; you and the world are one. Your problem is the world's problem. You may be the result of certain tendencies, of environmental influences, but you are not different fundamentally from another. Inwardly we are very much alike; we are all driven by greed, ill will, fear, ambition and so on. Our beliefs, hopes, aspirations have a common basis. We are one; we are one humanity, though the artificial frontiers of economics and politics and prejudice divide us. If you kill another, you are destroying yourself. You are the centre of the whole and without understanding yourself you cannot understand Reality.

We have an intellectual knowledge of this unity but we keep

knowledge and feeling in different compartments and hence we never experience the extraordinary unity of man. When knowledge and feeling meet there is experience. These talks will be utterly useless if you do not experience as you are listening. Do not say, I will understand later, but experience now. Do not keep your knowledge and your feeling separate for out of this separation grow confusion and misery. You must experience this living unity of man. You are not separate from the Japanese, the Hindu, the Negro or the German. To experience this immense unity be open, become conscious of this division between knowledge and feeling; do not be a slave to compartmental philosophy.

Without self-knowledge understanding is not possible. Self-knowledge is extremely arduous and difficult, for you are a complex entity. You must approach the understanding of the self simply, without any pretensions, without any theories. If I would understand you I must have no preconceived formulations about you, there must be no prejudice; I must be open, without judgment, without comparison. This is very difficult for, with most of us, thought is the result of comparison, of judgment. Through approximation we think we are understanding, but is understanding born of comparison, judgment? Or is it the outcome of non-comparative thought? If you would understand something do you compare it with something else or do you study it for itself?

Thought born of comparison is not right thinking. Yet in studying ourselves we are comparing, approximating. It is this that prevents the understanding of ourselves. Why do we judge ourselves? Is not our judgment the outcome of our desire to become something, to gain, to conform, to protect ourselves? This

very urge prevents understanding.

As I said, you are a complex entity, and to understand it you must examine it. You cannot understand it if you are comparing it with the yesterday or with the tomorrow. You are an intricate mechanism but comparison, judgment, identification prevent comprehension. Do not be afraid that you will become sluggish, smug, self-contented if you do not compete in comparison. Once you have perceived the futility of comparison there is a great freedom. Then you are no longer striving to become but there is freedom to understand. Be aware of this comparative process of your thinking - experience all this as I am explaining - and feel its futility, its fundamental thoughtlessness; you will then experience a great freedom, as though you had laid down a wearisome burden. In this freedom from approximation and so from identification, you will be able to discover and understand the realities of yourself. If you do not compare, judge, then you will be confronted with yourself and this will give clarity and strength to uncover great depths. This is essential for the understanding of Reality. When there is no self-approximation then thought is liberated from duality; the problem and the conflict with the opposites fall away. In this freedom there is a revolutionary, creative understanding.

There is not one of us who is not confronted with the problem of killing and non-killing, violence and non-violence. Some of you may feel that as your sons, brothers or husbands are not involved in this mass murder, called war, you are not immediately concerned with this problem, but if you will look a little more closely you will see how deeply you are involved. You cannot escape it. You must, as an individual, have a definite, attitude towards killing and non-



killing. If you have not been aware of it you are being confronted with it now; you must face the issue, the dualistic problem of capitalism and communism, love and hate, killing and non-killing and so on. How are you to find the truth of the matter? Is there any release from conflict in the endless corridor of duality? Many believe that in the very struggle of the opposites there is creativeness, that this conflict is life, and to escape from it is to be in illusion. Is this so? Does not an opposite contain an element of its own opposite and so produce endless conflict and pain? Is conflict necessary for creation? Are the moments of creativeness the outcome of strife and pain? Does not the state of creative being come into existence when all pain and struggle have utterly ceased? You can experience this for yourself. This freedom from opposites is not an illusion; in it alone is the answer to all of our confusion and conflicting problems.

You are faced with the problem of killing your brother in the name of religion, of peace, of country and so on. How shall you find the answer in which further conflicting, further opposing problems are not inherent? To find a true, lasting answer, must you not go outside of the dualistic pattern of thought. You kill because your property, your safety, your prestige are threatened; as with the individual so with the group, with the nation. To be free from violence and non-violence there must be freedom from acquisitiveness, ill will, lust and so on. But most of us do not go into the problem deeply and are satisfied with reform, with alteration within the pattern of duality. We accept as inevitable this conflict of duality and within that pattern try to bring about modification, change; within it we maneuver to a better position, to

a more advantageous point for ourselves. Change or reform merely within the pattern of duality produces only further confusion and pain and hence is retrogression.

You must go beyond the pattern of duality to solve permanently the problem of opposites. Within the pattern there is no truth, however much we may be caught in it; if we seek truth in it we will be led to many delusions. We must go beyond the dualistic pattern of the I and the not I, the possessor and the possessed. Beyond and above the endless corridor of duality lies Truth. Beyond and above the conflicting and painful problem of opposites lies creative understanding. This is to be experienced, not to be speculated upon; not to be formulated but to be realized through deep awareness of the dualistic hindrances.

Questioner: I am sure most of us have seen authentic pictures in movies and in magazines of the horrors and the barbarities of the concentration camps. What should be done, in your opinion, with those who have perpetrated these monstrous atrocities? Should they not be punished?

Krishnamurti: Who is to punish them? Is not the judge often as guilty as the accused? Each one of us has built up this civilization, each one has contributed towards its misery; each one is responsible for its actions. We are the outcome of each other's actions and reactions; this civilization is a collective result. No country or people is separate from another; we are all interrelated; we are one. Whether we acknowledge it or not, when a misfortune happens to a people, we share in it as in its good fortune. You may not separate yourself to condemn or to praise.

The power to oppress is evil and every group that is large and

well organized becomes a potential source of evil. By shouting loudly the cruelties of another country you think you can overlook those of your own. It is not only the vanquished but every country that is responsible for the horrors of war. War is one of the greatest catastrophes; the greatest evil is to kill another. Once you admit such an evil into your heart then you let loose countless minor disasters. You do not condemn war itself but him who is cruel in war.

You are responsible for war; you have brought it about by your everyday action of greed, ill will, passion. Each one of us has built up this competitive, ruthless civilization, in which man is against man. You want to root out the causes of war, of barbarity in others, while you yourself indulge in them. This leads to hypocrisy and to further wars. You have to root out the causes of war, of violence, in yourself, which demands patience and gentleness, not bloody condemnation of others.

Humanity does not need more suffering to make it understand but what is needed is that you should be aware of your own actions, that you should awaken to your own ignorance and sorrow and so bring about in yourself compassion and tolerance. You should not be concerned with punishments and rewards but with the eradication in yourself of those causes that manifest themselves in violence and in hate, in antagonism and ill will. In murdering the murderer you become like him; you become the criminal. A wrong is not righted through wrong means; only through right means can a right end be accomplished. If you would have peace you must employ peaceful means, and mass murder, war, can only lead to further murder, further suffering. There can be no love through

bloodshed; an army is not an instrument of peace. Only good will and compassion can bring peace to the world, not might and cunning nor mere legislation.

You are responsible for the misery and disaster that exist, you who in your daily life are cruel, oppressive, greedy, ambitious. Suffering will continue till you eradicate in yourself those causes that breed passion, greed and ruthlessness. Have peace and compassion in your heart and you will find the right answer to your questions.

Questioner: At this time and in our present way of life our feelings become blunted and hard. Can you suggest a way of life that will make us more sensitive? Can we become so in spite of noise, haste, all the competitive professions and pursuits? Can we become so without dedication to a higher source of life?

Krishnamurti: Is it not necessary for clear and right thinking to be sensitive? To feel deeply must not the heart be open? Must not the body be healthy to respond eagerly? We blunt our minds, our feelings, our bodies, with beliefs and ill will, with strong and hardening stimulants. It is essential to be sensitive, to respond keenly and rightly but we become blunted, hard, through our appetites. There is no separate entity such as the mind, apart from the organism as a whole, and when the organism as a whole is ill-treated, wasted, distracted, then insensitivity sets in. Our environment, our present way of life blunts us, wastes us. How can you be sensitive when every day you indulge in reading or seeing pictures of the slaughter of thousands - this mass murder reported as though it were a successful game. First time you read the reports you may feel sick at heart but the constant repetition of brutal

ruthlessness dulls your mind-heart, immunizing you to the utter barbarism of modern society. The radios, magazines, cinemas are ever wasting your sensitive pliabilitys; you are forced, threatened, regimented and how can you, in the midst of this noise, haste and false pursuits remain sensitive for the cultivation of right thinking?

If you would not have your feelings blunted and hard, you must pay the price for it; you must abandon haste, distraction, wrong professions and pursuits. You must become aware of your appetites, your limiting environment, and by rightly understanding them you begin to reawaken your sensitivity. Through constant awareness of your thoughts-feelings, the causes of self-enclosure and narrowness fall away. If you would be highly sensitive and clear, you must deliberately work for it; you cannot be worldly and yet be pure in the pursuit of Reality. Our difficulty is we want both, the burning appetites and the serenity of Reality. You must abandon the one or the other; you cannot have both. You cannot indulge and yet be alert; to be keenly aware there must be freedom from those influences that are crystallizing, blunting.

We have over developed the intellect at the cost of our deeper and clearer feelings and a civilization that is based on the cultivation of the intellect must bring about ruthlessness and the worship of success. The emphasis on intellect or on emotion leads to unbalance, and intellect is ever seeking to safeguard itself. Mere determination only strengthens the intellect and blunts and hardens it; it is ever self-aggressive in becoming or not-becoming. The ways of the intellect must be understood through constant awareness and its re-education must transcend its own reasoning.

Questioner: I find there is conflict between my occupation and my

relationship. They go in different directions. How can I make them meet?

Krishnamurti: Most of our occupations are dictated by tradition, or by greed, or by ambition. In our occupation we are ruthless, competitive, deceitful, cunning and highly self-protective. If we weaken at any time we may go under, so we must keep up with the high efficiency of the greedy machine of business. It is a constant struggle to maintain a hold, to become sharper and cleverer. Ambition can never find lasting satisfaction; it is ever seeking wider fields for self-assertiveness.

But in relationship quite a different process is involved. In it there must be affection, consideration, adjustment, self-denial, yielding; not to conquer but to live happily. In it there must be self-effacing tenderness, freedom from domination, from possessiveness; but emptiness and fear breed jealousy and pain in relationship. Relationship is a process of self-discovery, in which there is wider and deeper understanding; relationship is a constant adjustment in self-discovery. It demands patience, infinite pliability and a simple heart.

But how can the two meet together, self-assertiveness and love, occupation and relationship? The one is ruthless, competitive, ambitious, the other is self-denying, considerate, gentle; they cannot come together. With one hand people deal in blood and money, and with the other they try to be kind, affectionate, thoughtful. As a relief from their thoughtless and dull occupations they seek comfort and ease in relationship. But relationship does not yield comfort for it is a distinctive process of self-discovery and understanding. The man of occupation tries to seek through his

life of relationship comfort and pleasure as a compensation for his wearisome business. His daily occupation of ambition, greed and ruthlessness lead step by step to war and to the barbarities of modern civilization.

Right occupation is not dictated by tradition, greed or ambition. If each one is seriously concerned in establishing right relationship, not only with one but with all, then he will find right occupation. Right occupation comes with regeneration, with the change of heart, not with the mere intellectual determination to find it.

Integration is only possible if there is clarity of understanding on all the different levels of our consciousness. There can be no integration of love and ambition, deception and clarity, compassion and war. So long as occupation and relationship are kept apart, so long will there be endless conflict and misery. All reformation within the pattern of duality is retrogression; only beyond it, is there creative peace.

## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 1945

We are confronted every day, are we not, with dualistic problems, problems which are not theoretical or philosophical but actual? Verbally, emotionally, intellectually, we face them every day; good and bad, mine and yours, collectivism and individualism, becoming and non-becoming, worldliness and non-worldliness, and so on; an endless corridor of opposites in which thought-feeling shuffles back and forth. Are these problems of greed and non-greed, war and peace to be solved within the dualistic pattern or must thought-feeling go above and beyond to find a permanent answer? Within the pattern of duality there is no lasting answer. Each opposite has an element of its own opposite and so there can never be a permanent answer within the conflict of the opposites. There is a permanent, unique answer only outside of the pattern.

It is important to understand this problem of duality as deeply as possible. I am not dealing with it as an abstract, theoretical subject, but as an actual problem of our everyday life and conduct. We are aware, are we not, that our thought is a constant struggle within the pattern of duality, of good and bad, of being and not-being, of yours and mine? In it there is conflict and pain; in it all relationship is a process of sorrow; in it there is no hope but travail. Now, is the problem of love and hate to be solved within the field of its own conflict or must thought-feeling go above and beyond its known pattern?

To find the lasting solution to the conflict of duality and to the pain involved in choice, we must be intensely aware, in silent observation of the full implication of conflict. Only then will we



discover that there is a state in which the conflict of duality has ceased. There can be no integration of the opposites, greed and non-greed. He who is greedy, when he attempts to become non-greedy, is still greedy. Must he not abandon both greed and non-greed to be above and beyond the influence of both? Any becoming involves non-becoming and as long as there is becoming there must be duality with its endless conflict.

The cause of duality is desire, craving; through perception and sensation and contact there arise desire, pleasure, pain, want, non-want which in turn cause identification as mine and yours, and thus the dualistic process is set going. Is not this conflict worldliness? As long as the thinker separates himself from this thought, so long the vain conflict of the opposites will continue. As long as the thinker is concerned only with the modification of his thoughts and not with the fundamental transformation of himself, so long conflict and sorrow will continue. Is the thinker separate from his thought? Are not the thinker and his thought an inseparable phenomenon? Why do we separate the thought from the thinker? Is it not one of the cunning tricks of the mind so that the thinker can change his garb according to circumstances, yet remain the same? Outwardly there is the appearance of change but inwardly the thinker continues to be as he is. The craving for continuity, for permanency, creates this division between the thinker and his thoughts. When the thinker and his thought become inseparable then only is duality transcended. Only then is there the true religious experience. Only when the thinker ceases is there Reality. This inseparable unity of the thinker and his thought is to be experienced but not to be speculated upon. This experience is

liberation; in it there is inexpressible joy.

Right thinking alone can bring about the understanding and the transcending of cause-effect and the dualistic process; when the thinker and his thought are integrated through right meditation, then there is the ecstasy of the Real.

Questioner: These monstrous wars cry for a durable peace. Every one is speaking already of a Third World War. Do you see a possibility of averting the new catastrophe?

Krishnamurti: How can we expect to avert it when the elements and values that cause war continue? Has the war that is just over produced a deep fundamental change in man? Imperialism and oppression are still rampant, perhaps cleverly veiled; separate sovereign states continue; nations are maneuvering themselves into new positions of power; the powerful still oppress the weak; the ruling elite still exploit the ruled; social and class conflicts have not ceased; prejudice and hatred are burning everywhere. As long as professional priests with their organized prejudices justify intolerance and the liquidation of another being for the good of your country and the protection of your interests and ideologies, there will be war. As long as sensory values predominate over eternal value there will be war.

What you are the world is. If you are nationalistic, patriotic, aggressive, ambitious, greedy, then you are the cause of conflict and war. If you belong to any particular ideology, to a specialized prejudice, even if you call it religion, then you will be the cause of strife and misery. If you are enmeshed in sensory values then there will be ignorance and confusion. For what you are the world is; your problem is the world's problem.

Have you fundamentally changed because of this present catastrophe? Do you not still call yourself an American, an Englishman, an Indian, a German and so on? Are you not still greedy for position and power, for possessions and riches? Worship becomes hypocrisy when you are cultivating the causes of war; your prayers lead you to illusion if you allow yourself to indulge in hate and in worldliness. If you do not eradicate in yourself the causes of enmity, of ambition, of greed, then your gods are false gods who will lead you to misery. Only goodwill and compassion can bring order and peace to the world and not political blueprints and conferences. You must pay the price for peace. You must pay it voluntarily and happily and the price is the freedom from lust and ill will, worldliness and ignorance, prejudice and hate. If there were such a fundamental change in you, you could help to bring about a peaceful and sane world. To have peace you must be compassionate and thoughtful.

You may not be able to avert the Third World War but you can free your heart and mind from violence and from those causes that bring about enmity and prevent love. Then in this dark world there will be some who are pure of heart and mind, and from them perhaps the seed of a true culture might come into being. Make pure your heart and mind for by your life and action only can there be peace and order. Do not be lost and confused in organizations but remain wholly alone and simple. Do not seek merely to prevent catastrophe but rather let each one deeply eradicate those causes that breed antagonism and strife.

Questioner: I have written down, as you suggested last year, my thoughts and feelings for several months, but I don't seem to get

much further with it. Why? What more am I to do?

Krishnamurti: I suggested last year, as a means to self-knowledge and right thinking, that one should write down every thought-feeling, the pleasant as well as the unpleasant. Thus one becomes aware of the whole content of consciousness, the private thoughts and secret motives, intentions and bondages. Thus through constant self-awareness there comes self-knowledge which brings about right thinking. For without self-knowledge there can be no understanding. The source of understanding is within oneself and there is no comprehension of the world and your relationship to it without deep self-knowledge.

The questioner wants to know why he is not able to penetrate within himself deeply and discover the hidden treasure that lies beyond the superficial attempts at self-knowledge. To dig deeply you must have the right instrument, not merely the desire to dig. To cultivate self-knowledge there must be capacity and not a vague wish for it. Being and wishing are two different things.

To cultivate the right instrument of perception thought must cease to condemn, to deny, to compare and judge or to seek comfort and security. If you condemn or are gratified with what you have written down then you will put an end to the flow of thought- feeling and to understanding. If you wish to understand what another is saying surely you must listen without any bias, without being distracted by irrelevancies. Similarly, if you wish to understand your own thoughts-feelings, you must observe them with kindly dispassion and not with an attitude of condemnation or approval. Identification prevents and perverts the flow of thought-feeling; tolerant disinterestedness is essential for self-knowledge;

self-knowledge opens the door to deep and wide understanding. But it is difficult to be calm with regard to oneself, to one's reactions and so on, for we have set up a habit of self-condemnation, of self-justification and it is of this habit that one must be aware. Through constant and alert awareness, not through denial, does thought free itself from habit. This freedom is not of time but of understanding. Understanding is ever in the immediate present.

To cultivate the right instrument of perception there must be no comparison for when you compare you cease to understand. If you compare, approximate, you are being merely competitive, ambitious and your end then is success in which inherently is failure. Comparison implies a pattern of authority according to which you are measuring and guiding yourself. The oppression of authority cripples understanding. Comparison may produce a desired result but it is an impediment to self-knowledge. Comparison implies time and time does not yield understanding.

You are a complex living organism; understand yourself not through comparison but through perception of what is, for the present is the doorway to the past and to the future. When thought is free of comparison and identification and their uncreative burden, it is then able to be calm and clear. This habit of comparison, as also the habit of condemnation and approval, leads to conformity and in conformity there is no understanding.

The self is not a static entity but very active, alertly capable in its demands and pursuits; to follow and to understand the endless movement of the self a keen, pliable mind-heart is necessary, a mind capable of intense self-awareness. To understand, mind must

delve deeply and yet it must know when to be alertly passive. It would be foolish and unbalanced to keep on digging without the recuperative and healing power of passivity. We search, analyze, look into ourselves, but it is a process of conflict and pain; there is no joy in it for we are judging or justifying or comparing. There are no moments of silent awareness, of choiceness passivity. It is this choiceless awareness, this creative passivity that is even more essential than self-observation and investigation. As the fields are cultivated, sown, harvested and allowed to lie fallow so must we live the four seasons in a day. If you cultivate, sow and harvest without giving rest to the soil it would soon become unproductive. The period of fallowness is as essential as tilling; when the earth lies fallow the winds, the rains, the sunshine bring to it creative productivity and it renews itself. So must the mind-heart be silent, alertly passive after travail, to renew itself.

Thus through self-awareness of every thought-feeling the ways of the self are known and understood. This self-awareness with its self-observation and alert passivity brings deep and wide self-knowledge. From self-knowledge there comes right thinking; without right thinking there is no meditation.

Questioner: The problem of earning a decent living is predominant with most of us. Since economic currents of the world are hopelessly interdependent I find that almost anything I do either exploits others or contributes to the cause of war. How is one who honestly wishes to achieve right means of livelihood to withdraw from the wheels of exploitation and war?

Krishnamurti: For him who truly wishes to find a right means of livelihood economic life, as at present organized, is certainly

difficult. As the questioner says, economic currents are interrelated and so it is a complex problem, and as with all complex human problems it must be approached with simplicity. As society is becoming more and more complex and organized, regimentation of thought and action is being enforced for the sake of efficiency. Efficiency becomes ruthlessness when sensory values predominate, when eternal value is set aside.

Obviously there are wrong means of livelihood. He who helps in manufacturing arms and other methods to kill his fellowman is surely occupied with furthering violence which never brings about peace in the world; the politician who, either for the benefit of his nation or of himself or of an ideology, is occupied in ruling and exploiting others, is surely employing wrong means of livelihood which lead to war, to the misery and sorrow of man; the priest who holds to a specialized prejudice, dogma or belief, to a particular form of worship and prayer is also using wrong means of livelihood, for he is only spreading ignorance and intolerance which set man against man. Any profession that leads to and maintains the divisions and conflict between man and man is obviously a wrong means of livelihood. Such occupations lead to exploitation and strife.

Our means of livelihood are dictated, are they not, through tradition or through greed and ambition? Generally we do not deliberately set about choosing the right means of livelihood. We are only too thankful to get what we can and blindly follow the economic system that is about us. But the questioner wants to know how to withdraw from exploitation and war. To withdraw from them he must not allow himself to be influenced, nor follow

traditional occupation, nor must he be envious and ambitious. Many of us choose some profession because of tradition or because we are of a family of lawyers or soldiers or politicians or traders; or our greed for power and position dictates our occupation; ambition drives us to compete and be ruthless in our desire to succeed. So he who would not exploit or contribute to the cause of war must cease to follow tradition, cease to be greedy, ambitious, self-seeking. If he abstains from these he will naturally find right occupation.

But though it is important and beneficial, right occupation is not an end in itself. You may have a right means of livelihood but if you are inwardly insufficient and poor you will be a source of misery to yourself and so to others; you will be thoughtless, violent, self-assertive. Without that inward freedom of Reality you will have no joy, no peace. In the search and discovery of that inward Reality alone can we be not only content with little, but aware of something that is beyond all measure. It is this which must be first sought out; then other things will come into being in its wake.

This inward freedom of creative Reality is not a gift; it is to be discovered and experienced. It is not an acquisition to be gathered to yourself to glorify yourself. It is a state of being, as silence, in which there is no becoming, in which there is completeness. This creativeness may not necessarily seek expression; it is not a talent that demands an outward manifestation. You need not be a great artist nor have an audience; if you seek these you will miss that inward Reality. It is neither a gift, nor is it the outcome of talent; it is to be found, this imperishable treasure, when thought frees itself



from lust, ill will and ignorance; when thought frees itself from worldliness and personal craving to be; it is to be experienced through right thinking and meditation. Without this inward freedom of Reality existence is pain. As a thirsty man seeks water, so must we seek. Reality alone can quench the thirst of impermanency.

Questioner: I am an inveterate smoker. I have tried several times to give it up but failed each time. How am I to give it up once and for all?

Krishnamurti: Do not strive to give it up; as with so many habits mere struggle against them only strengthens them. Understand the whole problem of habit, the mental, emotional and physical. Habit is thoughtlessness and to struggle against thoughtlessness by determined ignorance is vain, stupid. You must understand the process of habit through constant awareness of the grooves of the mind and of the habitual emotional responses. In understanding the deeper issues of habit the superficial ones fall away. Without understanding the deeper causes of habit, suppose you are able to master the habit of smoking or any other habit, you still will be as you are, thoughtless, empty, a plaything of environment.

How to give up a particular habit is surely not the primary question for much deeper things are involved. No problem can be solved on its own level. Is any problem solved within the pattern of opposites? Obviously there is conflict within the pattern but does this conflict resolve the problem? Must you not go outside the pattern of conflict to find a lasting answer? The struggle against a habit does not necessarily result in its abandonment; other habits may be developed or substituted. The struggle merely to overcome

habits, without uncovering their deeper significance, makes the mind-heart thoughtless, superficial, insensitive. As with anger, as with armies, conflict exhausts, and no major issue is solved. Similarly conflict between opposites only blunts the Mind-heart and it is this dullness that prevents the understanding of the problem. Please see the importance of this. Conflict between two opposing desires must end in weariness, in thoughtlessness.

It is this thoughtlessness that must be considered, not the mere giving up of a habit or conflict. The abandonment of a habit will naturally follow if there is thoughtfulness, if there is sensitivity. This sensitivity is blunted, hardened, by the constant struggle of opposing desires. So if you want to smoke, smoke; but be intensely aware of all the implications of habit: thoughtlessness, dependency, loneliness, fear and so on. Do not merely struggle against habit but be aware of its full significance.

It is considered intelligent to be in the conflict of the opposites; the struggle between good and evil, between collectivism and individualism, is thought to be necessary for the growth of man; the conflict between God and Devil is accepted as an inevitable process. Does this conflict between the opposites lead to Reality? Does it not lead to ignorance and illusion? Is evil to be transcended by its opposite? Must not thought go above and beyond the conflict of both? This conflict of the opposites does not lead to righteousness, to understanding; it leads to weariness, thoughtlessness, insensitivity. Perhaps the criminal, the sinner may be nearer comprehension than the man who is self-righteous in his smug struggle of opposing desires. The criminal could be aware of his crime so there is hope for him, whereas the man in self-

righteous conflict of the opposites is merely lost in his own petty ambition to become. The one is vulnerable while the other is enclosed, hardened by his conflict; the one is still susceptible while the other is made insensitive through the conflict and pain of constant struggle to become.

Do not lose yourself in the conflict and pain of the opposites. Do not compare and strive to become the opposite of that which you are. Be wholly, choicelessly aware of what is, of your habit, of your fear, of your tendency and in this single flame of awareness that which is, is transformed. This transformation is not within the pattern of duality; it is fundamental, creative, with the breath of reality. In this flame of awareness all problems are finally resolved. Without this transformation life is a struggle and pain and there is no joy, no peace.

## OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 1945

Is it not important to understand and so transcend conflict? Most of us live in a state of inner conflict which produces outer turmoil and confusion; many escape from conflict into illusion, into various activities, into knowledge and ideation, or become cynical and depressed. There are some who, understanding conflict, go beyond its limitations. Without understanding the inward nature of conflict, the warring field which we are, there can be no peace, no joy.

Most of us are caught up in an endless series of inward conflicts and without resolving them life is utterly wasteful and empty. We are aware of two opposing poles of desire, the wanting and the not-wanting. The conflict between comprehension and ignorance we accept as part of our nature; we do not see that it is impossible to resolve this conflict within the pattern of duality and so we accept it, making a virtue of conflict. We have come to regard it as essential for growth, for the perfecting of man. Do we not say that through conflict we shall learn, we shall understand? We give a religious significance to this conflict of opposites but does it lead to virtue, to clarification, or does it lead to ignorance, to insensitivity, to death? Have you never noticed that in the midst of conflict there is no understanding at all, only a blind struggle? Conflict is not productive of understanding. Conflict leads, as we have said, to apathy, to delusion. We must go outside the pattern of duality for creative, revolutionary understanding.

Does not conflict, the struggle to become and not to become, make for a self-enclosing process? Does it not create self-consciousness? Is not the very nature of the self one of conflict and

pain? When are you conscious of yourself? When there is opposition, when there is friction, when there is antagonism. In the moment of joy, self-consciousness is non-existent; when there is happiness you do not say I am happy; only when it is absent, when there is conflict, do you become self-conscious. Conflict is a recall to oneself, an awareness of one's own limitation; it is this which causes self-consciousness. This constant struggle leads to many forms of escape, to illusion; without understanding the nature of conflict, the acceptance of authority, belief or ideology only leads to ignorance and further sorrow. With the understanding of conflict these become impotent and worthless.

Choice between opposing desires merely continues conflict; choice implies duality; through choice there is no freedom, for will is still productive of conflict. Then how is it possible for thought to go beyond and above the pattern of duality? Only when we understand the ways of craving and of self-gratification is it possible to transcend the endless conflict of opposites. We are ever seeking pleasure and avoiding sorrow; the constant desire to become hardens the mind-heart, causing strife and pain. Have you not noticed how ruthless a man is in his desire to become? To become something in this world is relatively the same as becoming something in what is considered the spiritual world; in each, man is driven by the desire to become and this craving leads to incessant conflict, to peculiar ruthlessness and antagonism. Then to renounce is to acquire and acquisition is the seed of conflict. This process of renouncing and acquiring, of becoming and not becoming is an endless chain of sorrow.

How to go beyond and above this conflict is our problem. This

is not a theoretical question but one that confronts us almost all of the time. We can escape into some fancy which can be rationalized and made to seem real but nevertheless it is delusion; it is not made real by cunning explanations nor by the number of its adherents. To transcend conflict the craving to become must be experienced and understood. The desire to become is complex and subtle but as with all complex things it must be approached simply. Be intensely aware of the desire to become. Be aware of the feeling of becoming; with feeling there comes sensitivity which begins to reveal the many implications of becoming. Feeling is hardened by the intellect and by its many cunning rationalizations, and however much the intellect may unravel the complexity of becoming it is incapable of experiencing. You may verbally grasp all this but it will be of little consequence; only experience and feeling can bring the creative flame of understanding.

Do not condemn becoming but be aware of its cause and effect in yourself. Condemnation, judgment and comparison do not bring the experience of understanding; on the contrary they will stop experience. Be aware of identification and condemnation, justification and comparison; be aware of them and they will come to an end. Be silently aware of becoming; experience this silent awareness. Being still and becoming still are two different states. The becoming still can never experience the state of being still. It is only in being still that all conflict is transcended.

Questioner: Will you please talk about death? I do not mean the fear of death but rather the promise and hope which the thought of death must always hold for those who are aware throughout life that they do not belong.

Krishnamurti: Why are we concerned more with death than with living? Why do we look to death as a release, as a promise of hope? Why should there be more happiness, more joy in death, than in life? Why need we look to death as a renewal, rather than to life? We want to escape from the pain of existence into a promise and hope that the unknown holds. Living is conflict and misery and as we educate ourselves to inevitable death, we look to death for reward. Death is glorified or shunned depending on the travail of life; life is a thing to be endured and death to be welcomed. Again we are caught in the conflict of the opposites. There is no truth in the opposites. We do not understand life, the present, so we look to the future, to death. Will tomorrow, the future, death, bring understanding? Will time open the door to Reality? We are ever concerned with time, the past weaving itself into the present and into the future, we are the product of time, the past; we escape into the future, into death.

The present is the Eternal. Through time the Timeless is not experienced. The now is ever existent; even if you escape into the future, the now is ever present. The present is the doorway to the past. If you do not understand the present now, will you understand it in the future? What you are now you will be, if the present is not understood. Understanding comes only through the present; postponement does not yield comprehension. Time is transcended only in the stillness of the present. This tranquillity is not to be gained through time, through becoming tranquil; there must be stillness, not the becoming still. We look to time as a means to become; this becoming is endless, it is not the Eternal, the Timeless. The becoming is endless conflict, leading to illusion. In

the stillness of the present is the Eternal.

But thought-feeling is weaving back and forth, like a shuttle, between the past, the present and the future; it is ever rearranging its memories; ever maneuvering itself into a better position, more advantageous and comforting to itself. It is forever dissipating and formulating and how can such a mind be still, creatively empty? It is continually causing its own becoming by endless effort, and how can such a mind understand the still being of the present? Right thinking and meditation only can bring about the clarity of understanding and in this alone is there tranquillity.

The death of someone whom you love brings sorrow. The shock of that sorrow is benumbing, paralysing, and as you come out of it you seek an escape from that sorrow. The lack of companionship, the habits that are revealed, the void and the loneliness that are uncovered through death cause pain, and you instinctively want to run away from it. You want comfort, a palliative to ease the suffering. Suffering is an indication of ignorance, but in seeking an escape from suffering you are only nourishing ignorance. Instead of blunting the mind-heart in sorrow through escapes, comforts, rationalizations, beliefs, be intensely aware of its cunning defence and comforting demands and then there will be the transformation of that emptiness and sorrow. Because you seek to escape sorrow pursues, because you seek comfort and dependence, loneliness is intensified. Not to escape, not to seek comfort, is extremely difficult and only intense self-awareness can eradicate the cause of sorrow.

In death we seek immortality; in the movement of birth and death we long for permanency; caught in the flux of time we crave



for the Timeless; being in shadow we believe in light. Death does not lead to immortality; there is immortality only in life without death. In life we know death for we cling to life. We gather, we become; because we gather death comes, and knowing death we cling to life.

The hope and belief in immortality is not the experiencing of immortality. Belief and hope must cease for the immortal to be. You the believer, the maker of desire, must cease for the immortal to be. Your very belief and hope strengthen the self and you will know only birth and death. With the cessation of craving, the cause of conflict, there comes creative stillness and in this silence there is that which is birth-less and deathless. Then life and death are one.

Questioner: It is easier to be free from sexual cravings than from subtle ambitions; for individuality wants self-expression with every breath. To be free from one's egotism means complete revolution in thinking. how can one remain in the world with such a reversal of mind?

Krishnamurti: Why do we want to remain in the world, the world that is so ruthless, ignorant and lustful? We may have to live in it but existence becomes painful only when we are of it. When we are ambitious, when there is enmity, when sensory values become all important, then we are lost and then the world holds us. Can we not live without greed among the greedy, content with little? Among the unhealthy can we not live in health? The world is not apart from us, we are the world; we have made it what it is. It has acquired its worldliness because of us and to leave it we must put away from us worldliness. Then only can we live with the world and not be of it.

Freedom from sex and ambition has no meaning without love. Chastity is not the product of the intellect; if the mind plans and plots to be chaste, it is no longer chaste. Love alone is chaste. Without love, the mere freedom from lust is barren and so the cause of endless strife and sorrow.

Once again the desire to be free from ambition is a conflict within the pattern of duality. If in this pattern you have trained yourself not to be ambitious you are still in the opposites, and so there is no freedom. You have only substituted one label for another and so conflict continues. Cannot we experience directly that state beyond the pattern of duality? Do not let us think in terms of becoming which indicate, do they not, the conflict of opposites? I am this and I want to become that only strengthens conflict and so blunts the mind-heart. We are accustomed to think in terms of the future, to be or to become. Is it not possible to be aware of what is? When we think-feel what is, without comparison, without judgment, with that complete integration of the thinker with his thought, then that which is, is utterly transformed; but this transformation can never take place within the field of duality. So let us be aware, not become aware, of ambition. When we are so aware we are conscious of all its implications; this feeling is important, not the mere intellectual analysis of the cause and effect of ambition. When you are aware of ambition you are conscious of its assertiveness, of its competitive ruthlessness, of its pleasures and pain; you are also conscious of its effect on society and relationship; of its social and business moralities which are immoral; of its cunning and hidden ways which ultimately lead to strife. Ambition breeds envy and ill will, the power to dominate

and to oppress. Be aware of yourself as you are and of the world which you have created, and without condemnation or justification be silently aware of your feeling ambitious.

If you are silently aware, as we explained, then the thinker and his thought are one, they are not separate but indivisible; then only is there complete transformation of ambition. But most of us, if we are aware at all, are conscious of the cause and effect of ambition and unfortunately we stop there; but if we looked more closely into this process of choice we would abandon it, for conflict is not productive of understanding. In abandoning it we would come upon the thinker and his thought. just as the qualities cannot be separated from the self, so the thinker cannot be separated from his thought. When such integration takes place there is complete transformation of the thinker. This is an arduous task demanding alert pliability and choiceless awareness. Meditation comes from right thinking and right thinking from self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge there is no understanding.

Questioner: I understand you to say that creativeness is an intoxication from which it is hard to free oneself. Yet you often speak of the creative person. Who is he if he is not the artist, the poet, the builder?

Krishnamurti: Is the artist, the poet, the builder necessarily the creative person? Is he not also lustful, worldly, seeking personal success? So is he not contributing to the chaos and misery in the world? Is he not responsible for its catastrophes and sorrows? He is responsible when he is seeking fame, is envious, when he is worldly, when his values are sensate; when he is passionate. Because he has a certain talent does that make the artist a creative

person? Creativeness is something infinitely greater than the mere capacity to express; mere successful expression and its recognition surely does not constitute creativeness. Success in this world implies, does it not, being of this world, the world of oppression and cruelty, ignorance and ill will? Ambition does produce results, but does it not bring with it misery and confusion for him who is successful and for his fellowman? The scientist, the builder, may have brought certain benefits but have they not brought also destruction and untold misery? Is this creativeness? Is it creativeness to set man against man as the politicians, the rulers, the priests are doing?

Creativeness comes into being when there is freedom from the bondage of craving with its conflict and sorrow. With the abandonment of the self with its assertiveness and ruthlessness and its endless struggles to become, there comes creative reality. In the beauty of a sunset or a still night, have you not felt intense, creative joy? At that moment, the self being temporarily absent, you are vulnerable, open to reality. This is a rare and unsought event, out of your control, but having once felt its intensity the self demands further enjoyment of it, and so conflict begins.

We all have experienced the temporary absence of the self and have felt at that moment the extraordinary creative ecstasy, but instead of its being rare and accidental is it not possible to bring about the right state in which Reality is eternal being? If you seek that ecstasy then it will be the activity of the self, which will produce certain results, but it will not be that state which comes through right thinking and right meditation. The subtle ways of the self must be known and understood for with self-knowledge comes

right thinking and meditation.

Right thinking comes with the constant flow of self-awareness, awareness of worldly actions as well as of the activities in meditation. Creativeness with its ecstasy comes with the freedom from craving, which is virtue.

Questioner: During the last few years you seem to have concentrated in your talks, more and more, on the development of right thinking. Formerly you used to speak more about mystic experiences. Are you deliberately avoiding this aspect now?

Krishnamurti: Is it not necessary to lay right foundation for right experience? Without right thinking is not experience illusory? If you would have a well built and lasting house, must you not lay it on a firm and right foundation? To experience is comparatively easy and depending on our conditioning, we experience. We experience according to our beliefs and ideals but do all such experiences bring freedom? Have you not noticed that according to one's tradition and belief experience comes? Tradition and creed mould experience, but to experience Reality which is not of any tradition or ideology, must not thought go above and beyond its own conditioning? Is not Reality ever the un-created? And must not the mind cease to create, to formulate, if it would experience the Uncreated? Must not the mind-heart be utterly still and silent for the being of the Real?

As any experience can be misinterpreted so any experience can be made to appear as the Real. On the interpreter depends the translation and if the translator is biased, ignorant, moulded in a pattern of thought, then his understanding will conform to his conditioning. If he is so-called religious, his experiences will be

according to his tradition and belief; if he is non-religious then his experiences will shape themselves according to his background. On the instrument depends its capacity; the mind-heart must make itself capable. It is capable of either experiencing the Real or creating for itself illusion. To experience the Real is arduous for it demands infinite pliability and deep, basic stillness. This pliability, this stillness is not the result of desire or of an act of will, for desire and will are the outcome of craving, the dual drive to be and not to be. Pliability and tranquillity are not the outcome of conflict; they come into being with understanding and understanding comes with self-knowledge.

Without self-knowledge you merely live in a state of contradiction and uncertainty; without self-knowledge what you think-feel has no basis; without self-knowledge enlightenment is not possible. You are the world, the neighbour, the friend, the so-called enemy. If you would understand you must first understand yourself, for in you is the root of all understanding. In you is the beginning and the end. To understand this vast complex entity mind-heart must be simple.

To understand the past, mind-heart must be aware of its activities in the present for through the present alone the past may be understood, but you will not understand the present if there is self-identification.

So through the present the past is revealed; through the immediate consciousness the many hidden layers are discovered and understood. Thus through constant awareness there comes deep and wide self-knowledge.

## OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 1945

Can each one who is responsible for the conflict and misery in himself and so in the world allow his mind-heart to be dulled by erroneous philosophies and ideas? If you who have created this struggle and suffering do not change fundamentally, will systems, conferences, blue prints bring about order and good will? Is it not imperative that you transform yourself, for, what you are the world is? Your inward conflicts express themselves in outward disasters. Your problem is the world's problem and you alone can solve it, not another; you cannot leave it to others. The politician, the economist, the reformer, is like yourself an opportunist, a cunning deviser of plans; but our problem, this human conflict and misery, this empty existence which produces such agonizing disasters, needs more than cunning device, more than superficial reforms of the politician and the propagandist. It needs a radical change of the human mind and no one can bring about this transformation save yourself. For what you are your group, your society, your leader is. Without you the world is not; in you is the beginning and end of all things. No group, no leader can establish eternal value save yourself.

Catastrophes and misery come when temporary sensate values dominate over eternal value. The permanent, eternal value is not the result of belief; your belief in God does not mean that you are experiencing eternal value, the way of your life alone will show its reality. Oppression and exploitation, aggressiveness and economic ruthlessness inevitably follow when we have lost Reality. You have lost it when professing the love of God you condone and

justify the murdering of your fellowman, when you justify mass murder in the name of peace and freedom. As long as you give supreme importance to sensory values there will be conflict, confusion and sorrow. Killing another can never be justified and we lose man's immense significance when sensate values remain predominant.

We will have misery and tribulation so long as religion is organized to be part of the State, the hand maiden of the State. It helps to condone organized force as policy of the State; and so encourages oppression, ignorance and intolerance. How then can religion allied with the State fulfil its only true function, that of revealing and maintaining eternal value? When Reality is lost and not sought after there is disunity and man will be against man. Confusion and misery cannot be banished by the forgetful process of time, by the comforting idea of evolution which only engenders slothfulness, smug acceptance and the continuous drift towards catastrophe; we must not let the course of our lives be directed by others, for others, or for the sake of the future. We are responsible for our life, not another; we are responsible for our conduct, not another; not another can transform us. Each one must discover and experience Reality and in that alone is there joy, serenity and highest wisdom.

How then can we come to this experience, through the change of outward circumstances or through transformation from within? Outer change implies the control of environment through legislation, through economic and social reform, through knowledge of facts and through fluctuating improvement, either violent or gradual. But does modification of the outer



circumstances ever bring about fundamental inner transformation? Is not inner transformation first necessary to bring about an outward result? You may, through legislation, forbid ambition as ambition breeds ruthlessness, self-assertiveness, competition and conflict, but can ambition be rooted out from without? Will it not, suppressed in one way, assert itself in another? Does not the inner motive, private thought-feeling always determine the outer? To bring about an outward peaceful transformation should there not take place first a deep psychological change? Can the outer, however pleasant, bring about lasting contentment? The inner craving ever modifies the outer. Psychologically what you are your society, your State, your religion is; if you are lustful, envious, ignorant, then your environment is what you are. We create the world in which we live. To bring about a radical and peaceful change there must be voluntary and intelligent inner transformation; this psychological change is surely not to be brought about through compulsion and if it is, then there will be such inner conflict and confusion as will again precipitate society into disaster. The inner regeneration must be voluntary, intelligent, not compelled. We must first seek Reality and then only can there be peace and order about us.

When you approach the problem of existence from without there is at once the dual process set going; in duality there is endless conflict and such conflict only dulls the mind-heart. When you approach the problem of existence from within there is no division between the inner and the outer; the division ceases because the inner is the outer, the thinker and his thoughts are one, inseparable. But we falsely separate the thought from the thinker

and so try to deal only with the part, to educate and modify the part, thereby hoping to transform the whole. The part ever becomes more and more divided and thus there is more and more conflict. So we must be concerned with the thinker from within and not with the modification of the part, his thought.

But unfortunately most of us are caught between the uncertainty of the outer and the uncertainty of the inner. It is this uncertainty that must be understood. It is the uncertainty of value that brings about conflict, confusion and sorrow and prevents our following a clear course of action either of the outer or of the inner. If we followed the outer with full awareness, perceiving its full significance, then such a course would inevitably lead to the inner, but unfortunately we get lost in the outer for we are not sufficiently pliable in our self-inquiry. As you examine sensory values by which our thoughts-feelings are dominated, and become aware of them without choice, you will perceive that the inner becomes clear. This discovery will bring freedom and creative joy. But this discovery and its experience cannot be made for you by another. Will your hunger be satisfied through watching another eat? Through your own self-awareness you must awaken to false values and so discover eternal value. There can be fundamental change within and without only when thought-feeling disentangles itself from those sensate values that cause conflict and sorrow.

Questioner: In truly great works of art, poetry, music there is expressed and conveyed something indescribable which seems to mirror Reality or Truth or God. Yet it is a fact that in their private lives most of those who created such works have never succeeded in extricating themselves from the vicious circle of conflict. How

can it be explained that an individual who has not liberated himself is able to create something in which the conflict of the opposites is transcended? Or to put the question in reverse, don't you have to conclude that creativeness is born out of conflict?

Krishnamurti: Is conflict necessary for creativeness? What do we mean by conflict? We crave to be, positively or negatively. This constant craving breeds conflict. We consider this conflict inevitable, almost virtuous; we consider it essential for human growth.

What happens when you are in conflict? Through conflict mind-heart is made weary, dull, insensitive. Conflict strengthens self-protective capacities, conflict is the substance on which the self thrives. In its very nature the self is the cause of all conflict, and where the self is, creation is not.

Is conflict necessary for creative being? When do you feel that creative overpowering ecstasy? Only when all conflict has ceased, only when the self is absent, only when there is complete tranquillity. This stillness cannot take place when the mind-heart is agitated, when it is in conflict; this only strengthens the self-enclosing process. As most of us are in a state of constant struggle within ourselves, we rarely have such moments of high sensibility or stillness, and when they do occur they are accidental. So we try to recapture those accidental moments, and only further burden our mind-heart with the dead past.

Does not the poet, the artist, go through the same process that we do? Perhaps he may be more sensitive, more alert and so more vulnerable, open, but surely he, too, experiences creation in moments of self-abnegation, self-forgetfulness, in moments of

complete stillness. This experience he tries to express in marble or in music; but does not conflict come into being in expressing the experience, in perfecting the word, and not at the moment of experience itself? Creation can only take place when the mind-heart is still, and not caught in the net of becoming. The open passivity to Reality is not the result of craving with its will and conflict.

Like us the artist has moments of stillness in which creation is experienced; then he puts it down in paint, in music, in form. His expression assumes great value for he has painted it, it is his work. Ambition, fame become important and in an endless, stupid struggle he is caught. He thus contributes to the world's misery, envy and bloodshed, passion and ill will. He gets lost in this struggle and the more he is lost the further recedes his sensibility, his vulnerability to truth. His worldly conflicts dim the joyous clarity even though his technical capacity helps him to carry on with his empty and hardening visions.

But we are not great artists, musicians or poets; we have no special gifts or talents; we have no release through marble, painting or through the garland of words. We are in conflict and sorrow but we, too, have occasional moments of the immensity of Truth. Then momentarily we forget ourselves but soon we are back into our daily turmoil, blunting and hardening our mind-heart. The mind-heart is never still; if it is, it is the silence of weariness, but such a state is not the silence of understanding, of wisdom. This creative, expectant emptiness is not brought about by will or by desire; it comes into being when conflict of the self ceases.

Conflict ceases only when there is complete revolution in value,

not mere substitution. Through self-awareness alone can the mind-heart free itself from all values; this transcending of all values is not easy, it comes not with practice but with the deepening of awareness. It is not a gift, a talent of the few, but all who are strenuous and eager can experience creative Reality.

Questioner: The present is an unmitigated tragic horror. Why do you insist that in the present is the Eternal?

Krishnamurti: The present is conflict and sorrow, with an occasional flash of passing joy. The present weaves back and forth into the past and into the future, and so the present is restless. The present is the result of the past, our being is founded upon it. How can you understand the past save through its result, the present? You cannot dig into the past by any other instrument than the one you have, which is the present. The present is the doorway to the past and if you wish, to the future. What you are is the result of the past, of yesterday, and to understand yesterday you must begin with today. To understand yourself, you must begin with yourself as you are today.

Without comprehending the present which is rooted in the past, you will have no understanding. The present misery of man is understood when through the door of the present he is able to be aware of the causes that have produced it. You cannot brush aside the present in trying to understand the past but only through awareness of the present does the past begin to unfold itself. The present is tragic and bloody; surely not by denying it, not by justifying it will we understand it. We have to face it as it is and uncover the causes that have brought about the present. How you regard the present, how your mind is conditioned to it, will reveal

the process of the past; if you are prejudiced, nationalistic, if you hate, what you are now will pervert your understanding of the past; your passion, ill will and ignorance, what you are now, will corrupt your understanding of the causes that have led to the present. In understanding yourself, as you are now, the roll of the past unfolds itself.

The present is of the highest importance; the present, however tragic and painful, is the only door to Reality. The future is the continuance of the past through the present; through understanding the present is the future transformed. The present is the only time for understanding for it extends into yesterday and into tomorrow. The present is the whole of time; in the seed of the present is the past and the future; the past is the present and the future is the present. The present is the Eternal, the Timeless. But we regard the present, the now, as a passage to the past or to the future; in the process of becoming, the present is a means to an end and thereby loses its immense significance. The becoming creates continuity, everlastingness, but it is not the Timeless, the Eternal. Craving to become weaves the pattern of time. Have you not experienced in moments of great ecstasy the cessation of time; there is no past, no future but an intense awareness, a timeless present? Having experienced such a state greed begins its activities and re-creates time, recalling, reviving, looking to the future for further experience, rearranging the pattern of time to capture the Timeless. Thus greed, the becoming, holds thought-feeling in the bondage of time.

So be aware of the present, however sorrowful or pleasant; then it will unfold itself as a time process and if thought-feeling can

follow its subtle and devious ways and transcend them, then that very extensional awareness is the timeless present. Look only to the present, neither to the past nor to the future, for love is the present, the Timeless.

Questioner: You decry war and yet are you not supporting it?

Krishnamurti: Are we not all of us maintaining this terrible mass murder? We are responsible, each one, for war; war is an end result of our daily life; it is brought into being through our daily thought-feeling-action. What we are in our occupational, social, religious relationships, that we project; what we are the world is.

Unless we understand the primary and secondary issues involved in the responsibility for war, we shall be confused and unable to extricate ourselves from its disaster. We must know where to lay the emphasis and then only shall we understand the problem. The inevitable end of this society is war; it is geared to war, its industrialization leads to war; its values promote war. Whatever we do within its borders contributes to war. When we buy something, the tax goes towards war; the postage stamps help to support war. We cannot escape from war go where we will, especially now, as society is organized for total war. The most simple and harmless work contributes to war in one way or another. Whether we like it or not, by our very existence we are helping to maintain war. So what are we to do? We cannot withdraw to an island or to a primitive community, for the present culture is everywhere. So what can we do? Shall we refuse to support war by not paying taxes, not buying stamps? Is that the primary issue? If it is not, and if it is only the secondary, then do not let us be distracted by it.

Is not the primary issue much deeper, that of the cause of war itself? If we can understand the cause of war then the secondary issue can be approached from a different point of view altogether; if we do not understand, then we shall be lost in it. If we can free ourselves from the causes of war then perhaps the secondary problem may not arise at all.

So emphasis must be laid upon the discovery within oneself of the cause of war; this discovery must be made by each one and not by an organized group, for group activities tend to make for thoughtlessness, mere propaganda and slogan, which only breed further intolerance and strife. The cause must be self-discovered and thus each one through direct experience liberates himself from it.

If we consider deeply we are well aware of the causes of war: passion, ill will and ignorance; sensuality, worldliness and the craving for personal fame and continuity; greed, envy and ambition; nationalism with its separate sovereignties, economic frontiers, social divisions, racial prejudices and organized religion. Cannot each one be aware of his greed, ill will, ignorance, and so free himself from them? We hold to nationalism for it is an outlet to our cruel, criminal instincts; in the name of our country or ideology we can murder or liquidate with impunity, become heroes, and the more we kill our fellowmen the more honor we receive from our country.

Now is not liberation from the cause of conflict and sorrow the primary issue? If we do not lay emphasis upon this how will the solution of the secondary problems stop war? If we do not root out the causes of war in ourselves, of what value is it to tinker with the



outward results of our inner state? We must, each one, dig deeply and clear away lust, ill will and ignorance; we must utterly abandon nationalism, racialism and those causes that breed enmity. We must concern ourselves wholly with that which is of primary importance and not be confused with secondary issues.

Questioner: You are very depressing. I seek inspiration to carry on. you do not cheer us with words of courage and hope. Is it wrong to seek inspiration?

Krishnamurti: Why do you want to be inspired? Is it not because in yourself you are empty, uncreative, lonely? You want to fill this loneliness, this aching void; you must have tried different ways of filling it and you hope to escape from it again by coming here. This process of covering up the arid loneliness is called inspiration. Inspiration then becomes a mere stimulation and as with all stimulation it soon brings its own boredom and insensitivity. So we go from one inspiration, stimulation, to another, each bringing its own disappointment and weariness; thus the mind-heart loses its pliability, its sensitivity; the inner capacity of tension is lost through this constant process of stretching and relaxing. Tension is necessary to discover but a tension that demands relaxation or a stimulation soon loses its capacity to renew itself, to be pliable, to be alert. This alert pliability cannot be induced from the outside; it comes when it is not dependent upon stimulation, upon inspiration.

Is not all stimulation similar in effect? Whether you take a drink or are stimulated by a picture or an idea, whether you go to a concert or to a religious ceremony, or work yourself up over an act however noble or ignoble, does not all this blunt the mind-heart? A

righteous anger, which is an absurdity, however stimulating and inspiring it may be, makes for insensitivity; and is not the highest form of intelligence, sensitivity, receptivity, necessary to experience Reality? Stimulation breeds dependence and dependence whether worthy or unworthy causes fear. It is relatively unimportant how one is stimulated or inspired, whether through organized church or politics or through distraction for the result will be the same - insensitivity caused through fear and dependence.

Distractions become stimulations. Our society primarily encourages distraction, distraction in every form. Our thinking-feeling itself has become a process of wandering away from the centre, from Reality. So it is extremely difficult to withdraw from all distractions for we have become almost incapable of being choicelessly aware of what is. So conflict arises which further distracts our thought-feeling, and it is only through constant awareness that thought-feeling is able to extricate itself from the net of distractions.

Besides, who can give you cheer, courage and hope? If we rely on another, however great and noble, we are utterly lost for dependence breeds possessiveness in which there is endless struggle and pain. Cheer and happiness are not ends in themselves; they are, as courage and hope, incidents in the search of something that is an end in itself. It is this end that must be sought after patiently and diligently, and only through its discovery will our turmoil and pain cease. The journey towards its discovery lies through oneself; every other journey is a distraction leading to ignorance and illusion. The journey within oneself must be

undertaken not for a result, not to solve conflict and sorrow; for the search itself is devotion, inspiration. Then the journeying itself is a revealing process, an experience which is constantly liberating and creative. Have you not noticed that inspiration comes when you are not seeking it? It comes when all expectation has ceased, when the mind-heart is still. What is sought after is self-created and so is not the Real.

Questioner: You say that life and death are one and the same thing. Please elaborate this startling statement.

Krishnamurti: We know birth and death, existence and non-existence; we are aware of this conflict between the opposites, the desire to live, to continue, and the fear of death, of noncontinuance. Our life is held in the pattern of becoming and non-becoming. We may have theories, beliefs and accordingly experience, but they are still within the field of duality, of birth and death.

We think-feel in terms of time, of living, of becoming, or of not becoming, or of death, or of extending this becoming beyond death. The pattern of our thought-feeling moves from the known to the known, from the past to the present, to the future; if there is fear of the future, it clings to the past or to the present. We are held in time and how can we, who think-feel in terms of time, experience the reality of Timelessness, in which life and death are one!

Have you not experienced in moments of great intensity the cessation of time? Such a cessation is generally forced upon one; it is accidental but depending upon our pleasure in it we desire to repeat the experience again. So we become once more prisoners of time. Is it not possible for the mind-heart to stop formulating, to be

utterly still and not forced into stillness by an act of will? Will and determination are still self-continuation and so within the field of time. Does not the determination to be, the will to become, imply self-growth, time, which makes for the fear of death?

As the stump of a dead tree in the middle of a stream gathers the floating wreckage so we gather, we cling to our accumulation; thus we and the deathless stream of life are separate. We sit on the dead stump of our accumulation and consider life and death; we do not let go the ever accumulating process and be of the living waters. To be free from accumulation there must be deep self-knowledge, not the superficial knowledge of the few layers of our consciousness. The discovery and the experience of all the layers of consciousness is the beginning of true meditation. In the tranquillity of mind-heart is wisdom and Reality.

Reality is to be experienced, not speculated upon. This experience can only be when the mind-heart ceases to accumulate. Mind-heart does not cease to accumulate through denial or through determination, but only through self-awareness; through self-knowledge the cause of accumulation is discovered. It is experienced only when the conflict of the opposites ceases. Only right thinking, which comes with self-knowledge and right meditation, can bring about the unity of life and death. It is only by dying each day that there can be eternal renewal.

It is difficult to so die if you are in the process of becoming, if you are gathering, sitting on the stump of dead accumulation. You must abandon it, plunge into the ever living waters; you must die each day to the day's gathering, die both to the pleasant and the unpleasant. We cling to the pleasant and let the unpleasant go; so

we strengthen in gratification and know death. Without seeking reward, let us abandon our gatherings and then only can there be the immortal. Then life is not opposed to death nor is death a darkening of life.

## OJAI 5TH PUBLIC TALK 1945

This morning I am going to answer questions only. These answers and talks will be of little significance if they remain merely on the verbal level. Most of us seek stimulation and find it in various ways but it soon wears out. Only experience keeps the mind-heart pliable and alert but experience is beyond and above intellectual and emotional gratification and stimulation. Feeling makes reason pliable and it is this pliability of reason with the vulnerability of feeling that brings experience. It is experience, when rightly understood, that transforms.

At all times, and especially now, there is need for transformation through vital experience; this transformation is essential in a world that has become utterly ruthless, a world whose values are predominantly sensate, a world that is corrupt in its own degradation. Without deeply and widely experiencing eternal value we shall not find any solution to our problems; any answer other than that of the Real will only increase our burden and sorrow. To so experience each one must stand alone, not dependent on any authority, on any organization, religious or secular, for dependence of any kind creates uncertainty and fear thus preventing the experiencing of the Real. In the outer world there is no hope, no clarity, no creative and renewing understanding, there is only bloodshed and confusion and mounting disaster. Only within is there understanding and this understanding is to be discovered, not through example, not through authority. Through self-awareness and self-knowledge only can come tranquillity and wisdom. There is no tranquillity if you are following another; there is no peace if

you are worldly; there is no understanding if there is self-ignorance. Through silent awareness of the outer and in being objectively aware of the events of life you are inevitably forced to be aware of the inner, the subjective; in comprehending the self the outer becomes clear and significant. The outer has no significance in itself; it has significance only in relation to the inner. To experience and understand the inner you must be prepared to be alone; you must withstand the persuasive weight of the outer, its logical and cunning deceptions.

Questioner: You said last Sunday that each one of us is responsible for these terrible wars. Are we also responsible for the abominable tortures in the concentration camps and for the deliberate extermination of a people in Central Europe?

Krishnamurti: Is it not very evident that each one of us is responsible for war? Wars do not come into being out of unknown causes, they have definite sources and those who wish to extricate themselves from this periodical madness called war must search out these causes and free themselves. War is one of the greatest calamities that could happen to man who is capable of experiencing the Real. He must be concerned with eliminating the cause of war within himself, not with who is less or more degraded and terrible in war. We must not be carried away with secondary issues but be aware of the primary issue which is organized killing itself. The secondary issues may cause fear and the desire for vengeance, but without understanding the essential reasons for war conflict and sorrow will not cease.

To kill another is the greatest crime. For man is capable of realizing the Highest. War, the deliberate organization of murder,

is the greatest catastrophe that man can bring upon himself for with it comes untold misery and destruction, degradation and corruption; when once you admit such a vast "evil" as the organized murder of others, then you open the door to a host of minor disasters. Each one of us is responsible for war for each one has brought about the present condition, consciously or unconsciously by his attitude towards life, by the false values he has given to existence. Having lost the eternal value the passing sensory values become all important. There is no end to ever expanding desire. Things are necessary but have no eternal value and the mad desire for possessions ever leads to strife and misery.

When acquisitiveness in every form is encouraged, when nationalism and separate sovereign states exist, when religion separates, when there is intolerance and ignorance then killing your fellowman is inevitable. War is the result of our every day life. Passion, ill will and oppression are justified when they are national; to kill for the State, for the country, for an ideology, is considered necessary, noble. Each one indulges in this degrading ruthlessness for there is in each one the desire to do harm. War becomes a means of releasing one's own brutal instincts and encourages irresponsibility. Such a state is only possible when sensate values predominate.

As each one is responsible for the shaping of this culture, if each one does not radically transform himself then how can there be an end to this brutal world and its ways? Each one is responsible for these tragedies and disasters, for tortures and bestialities, if he thinks-feels in terms of nations, groups, or thinks of himself as Hindu or Buddhist, Christian or Moslem. If a so-called "foreigner"



in India is killed by a nationalist, then I am responsible for that murder if I am a nationalist; but I am not responsible if I do not think-feel in terms of nations, groups or classes, if I am not lustful, if I have no ill will, if I am not worldly. Then only is there freedom from responsibility for killing, torturing, oppressing.

We have lost the feeling of humanity; we feel responsible only to the class or group to which we belong; we feel responsible to a name, to a label. We have lost compassion, the love of the whole, and without this quickening flame of life we look to politicians, to priests, to some economic planning for peace and happiness. In these there is no hope. In each one alone is there creative understanding, that compassion which is necessary for the well-being of man. Right means create right ends, wrong means will bring only emptiness and death, not peace and joy.

Questioner: I feel I cannot reach the other shore without help, without the Grace of God. If I can say Thy Will be Done and dissolve myself in it, do I not dissolve my limitations? If I can relinquish myself unconditionally is there not Grace to help me bridge the gulf which separates God and me?

Krishnamurti: This abandonment of the self is not an act of will; this crossing over to the other shore is not an activity of purpose or of gain. Reality comes in the fullness of silence and wisdom. You may not invite Reality, it must come to you; you may not choose Reality, it must choose you.

We must understand effort, unconditional stillness, self-abandonment; for through right awareness alone comes meditative tranquillity.

What is right effort? There is an understanding of right effort

when there is an awareness of the process of becoming. just as long as effort is made to become, so long will duality exist, the thinker separating himself from his thought. This conflict of opposites is considered inevitable and necessary for freedom and growth. When one who is greedy makes an effort to become non-greedy, this effort we consider righteous and spiritual. But is it right effort? Is effort spent in overcoming the opposite productive of understanding? Is one not still greedy in trying to become non-greedy? He may take on a new, gratifying verbal garb, but the maker of the effort is still the same, he is still greedy. The effort made to become, not only creates the conflict of opposites but also is directed along wrong channels, for, to become is still to be in conflict and sorrow; so there is no freedom for experiencing Truth in the long corridor of opposites.

Our effort is spent in denying or accepting and thus thought-feeling is made blunt in this endless conflict. This surely is wrong effort for it is not productive of creative understanding. Right endeavour consists in being choicelessly aware of this conflict, in being silently observant without identification. It is this silent, choiceless awareness of conflict that brings freedom. In this passive awareness that is tranquil, Reality comes into being.

Be aware of your conflict, of how you deny, justify, compare or identify; of how you try to become; be aware of the deep, full significance of the pain of the opposites. Then will come the experience of the inseparability of the thinker and his thought, the stillness of understanding through which alone there can be radical transformation, the crossing over to the other shore without the action of will.

There is a vast difference between becoming still and being still. We must die each day to all experiences and accumulations, fears and hopes, and we can only do this by actively being aware of our conflicts, and then being passively still. We must live each day the four seasons, the spring, summer, autumn and winter of passivity. As in winter the fields lie fallow, open to the heavens, to revitalize themselves, so the mind-heart must allow itself to be open, creatively empty. Then only can there be the breath of Reality.

This creative emptiness, this ardent passivity, is not brought about through an act of will. It is extremely difficult for those who are slaves to distraction, who are incessantly active, who are ever striving to become, to be alertly passive. If you would understand, the mind-heart must be still; there must be heightened sensitivity to receive and there can be tranquillity only in understanding. This silent awareness is not an act of determination but it comes in`to being when thought-feeling is not caught in the net of becoming. You never say to a child become still, but be still. We say to ourselves we will become and for this becoming we have various excuses and interminable reasons and so we are never still. The becoming still can never be the being still; only with the death of becoming is there being.

In moments of great creativity, in moments of great beauty, there is utter tranquillity; in these moments there is complete absence of the self with all its conflicts; it is this negation, the highest form of thinking-feeling, that is essential for creative being. But these moments are rare with most of us, the moments when the thinker and his thought are transcended; these occasions happen unexpectedly, but the self soon returns. Having once experienced

this living stillness thought-feeling clings to its memory thus preventing the further experience of Reality. This cultivation of memory is effort directed along wrong channels, resulting in the strengthening of the self with its conflict and pain; but if we are deeply aware of our problems and conflicts and understand them, then this very cultivation of self-knowledge brings about alert passivity and tranquillity. In this living silence is Reality. Only in utter simplicity, when all craving has ceased, is the bliss of Reality.

Questioner: I am an inventor and I happen to have invented several things which have been used in this war. I think I am opposed to killing but what am I to do with my capacity? I cannot suppress it as the power to invent drives me on.

Krishnamurti: Which do you think-feel is the more urgently important problem to understand, the power to kill or the capacity to invent? If you are concerned only with inventing, with the mere expression of your talent, then you must find out why you give so much emphasis to it. Does not your capacity give you a means of escape from life, from reality? Then is not your talent a barrier to relationship? To be is to be related and nothing can exist in isolation. So without self-knowledge your capacity to invent becomes dangerous to your neighbour and to yourself.

Does your occupation aid in destroying your fellowman? Your inventions and activities may temporarily help but if they lead him to ultimate destruction then of what use are they? If the end result of this culture is mass murder then of what significance is your talent? What is the purpose of inventing, improving, rearranging if it all leads to the destruction of man? If you are only interested in fulfilling your particular capacity, disregarding the wider issues of

life and the ultimate end of existence, then your talent is meaningless and worthless. Only in relation to the ultimate Reality is your capacity significant. I feel that all of you are not vitally interested in this question. Is this not also your problem? You may be an artist, a carpenter or have some other occupation and this question is as vital to you as to the inventor. If you are an artist or a doctor your occupation or the expression of your talent must have its foundation in reality, otherwise it becomes merely a form of self-expression and mere expression of the self leads inevitably to sorrow. If you are interested only in self-expression then you are contributing to the conflict, confusion and antagonism of man. Without first searching out the meaning of life mere self-expression, however gratifying, will only bring misery and disaster.

Beware of mere talent. With self-knowledge the craving for self-fulfilment is transformed. The craving for fulfillment brings its own frustration and disillusionment, for the desire for self-fulfilment arises from ignorance.

Questioner: Can I find God in a foxhole?

Krishnamurti: A man who is seeking God will not be in a fox-hole. How false are the ways of our thinking We create a false situation and in that hope to find truth; in the false we try to find the real. Happy is he who sees the false as the false and that which is true as true.

We have become perverted in the ways of our thinking-feeling. In sorrow we wish to find happiness; only in abandoning the cause of sorrow is there joy. You and the soldier have created a culture which forces you to murder and to be murdered, and in the midst of

this cruelty you desire to find love. If you are seeking God you will not be in a foxhole but if you are there and seek Him you will know how to act. We justify murder and in the very act of murdering we try to find love. We create a society essentially based on sensate value, on worldliness, which necessitates the foxhole. We justify and condone the foxhole and then, in the foxhole or in the bomber, we hope to find God, love. Without fundamentally altering the structure of our thought-feeling, the Real is not to be found. Being envious, greedy and ignorant we want to be peaceful, tolerant and wise; with one hand we murder and with the other we pacify. It is this contradiction that must be understood; you cannot have both greed and peace, the foxhole and God; you cannot justify ignorance and yet hope for enlightenment.

The very nature of the self is to be in contradiction; and only when thought-feeling frees itself from its own opposing desires can there be tranquillity and joy. This freedom with its joy comes with deep awareness of the conflict of craving. When you become aware of the dual process of desire and are passively alert there is the joy of the Real, joy which is not the product of will or of time.

You cannot escape from ignorance at any time, it must be dispelled through your own awakening; none can awaken you save yourself. Through your own self-awareness does the problem of your making cease to be.

Questioner: What is a lasting way to solve a psychological problem?

Krishnamurti: There are three stages of awareness, are there not, in any human problem? First, being aware of the cause and effect of the problem; second, being aware of its dual or contradictory

process; and third, being aware of self and experiencing the thinker and his thought as one.

Take any problem that you have: for example, anger. Be aware of its cause, physiological and psychological. Anger may arise from nervous tiredness and tension; it may arise from certain conditioning of thought-feeling, from fear, from dependence or from craving for security, and so on; it may arise through bodily and emotional pain. Many of us are aware of the conflict of the opposites; but because of pain or disturbance due to conflict, we instinctively seek to be rid of it violently or in varieties of subtle ways; we are concerned with escaping from the struggle rather than with understanding it. It is this desire to be rid of the conflict that gives strength to its continuity, and so maintains contradiction; it is this desire that must be watched and understood. Yet it is difficult to be alertly passive in the conflict of duality; we condemn or justify, compare or identify; so we are ever choosing sides and thus maintaining the cause of conflict. To be choicelessly aware of the conflict of duality is arduous but it is essential if you would transcend the problem.

The modification of the outer, of the thought, is a self-protective device of the thinker; he sets his thought in a new frame which safeguards him from radical transformation. It is one of the many cunning ways of the self. Because the thinker sets himself apart from his thought, problems and conflicts continue, and the constant modification of his thought alone, without radically transforming himself merely continues illusion.

The complete integration of the thinker with his thought cannot be experienced if there is no understanding of the process of

becoming and the conflict of opposites. This conflict cannot be transcended through an act of will, it can only be transcended when choice has ceased. No problem can be solved on its own plane; it can be resolved lastingly only when the thinker has ceased to become.



## OJAI 6TH PUBLIC TALK 1945

This morning I shall answer as many questions as possible.

Questioner: If we had not destroyed the evil that was in Central Europe it would have conquered us. Do you mean to say that we should not have defended ourselves? Aggression must be met. How would you meet it?

Krishnamurti: This wave of aggression, of blood, of organized criminality, seems to arise periodically in one group and pass over to another. This is recurrent in history. No country is free from this aggression. We are all, each in his way, responsible for this wave of

Is it possible to live without aggression and so without defence? Is all effort a series of attacks and defences? Can life be lived without this destructive effort? Each one should be aware of his responses to this problem. Does not all effort to become necessitate the self-assertiveness and self-expansion of the individual and so of the group or nation, and lead to conflict, antagonism and war?

Is it possible to solve this problem of aggression along the lines of defence? Defence implies self-protection, opposition and conflict, and is antagonism to be dissolved by opposition? Is it possible to live in this world and yet be free from this constant battle between yours and mine, with its ruthless attack and defence? Because we desire to protect our name, our property, our nationality, our religion, our ideals, we cultivate the spirit of attack and defence. We are possessive, acquisitive and so we have created a social structure which necessitates progressively ruthless exploitation and aggression. This acquisitive becoming breeds its

own opposition and so defence and attack become part of our daily existence. No solution can be found as long as we are thinking-feeling in terms of defence and attack, which only maintain confusion and strife.

Is it possible to think-feel without defence and attack? It is possible only when there is love, when each one abandons greed, ill will and ignorance which express themselves through nationalism, craving for power and other forms of criminality and cruelty. If one wishes to solve this problem permanently surely thought-feeling must free itself from all acquisitiveness and fear. This attitude of attack and defence is cultivated in our daily life and ends ultimately in war and other catastrophes. The difficulty lies in our own contradictory nature; we want peace and yet we cultivate those causes that bring about war and destruction. We want happiness and freedom and yet we indulge in lust, ill will and thoughtlessness; we pray for understanding and yet deny it in our daily life; we want to enjoy both opposites and so we are confused and lost.

If you want to put an end to this wave of ruthlessness, of appalling destruction and misery, if you wish to save your son, your husband, your neighbour, you must pay the price. This misery is not the creation of one group or race but of each one of us; each one must thoughtfully abandon the causes that produce these calamities and untold misery. You must completely set aside your nationalism, your greed and ill will, your craving for power and wealth and your adherence to organized religious prejudices which, while asserting the unity of man, set man against man. Only then will there be peace and joy.

Why is it that we seem to be incapable of living creatively and happily without destroying each other? Is it not because we so condition ourselves through our own passion, ill will and stupidity that we are incapable of living joyously and serenely? We must break through our own conditioning and be as nothing. We are afraid of being nothing so we escape and thus feed our fear with greed, hate, ambition.

The problem is not how to defend but how to transcend the desire for self-expansion, the craving to become. Only those individuals who abandon their passions, their craving for fame and personal immortality, can help to bring about creative peace and joy.

Questioner: In one's growth is there not a continuous and recurring process of the death of one's cherished hopes and desires; of cruel disillusionment in regard to the past; of transmutation of those negative phenomena into a more positive and vitalizing life - until the same stage is reached again on a higher spiral? Are not conflict and pain therefore indispensable to all growth and at all stages?

Krishnamurti: Are conflict and pain necessary for creative being? Is sorrow necessary for understanding? Is not conflict inevitable in becoming, in self-expanding? Is not the creative state of being the freedom from conflict, from accumulated existence? Does accumulation at any stage on the spiral of becoming bring about the creative being? There is becoming and growth along the horizontal path of existence, but does it lead to the Timeless? It is to be experienced only when the horizontal is abandoned. Is the experience of being, related to the conflict of the horizontal, the

conflict of becoming? Through time the Timeless cannot be realized.

What happens when we are in conflict? In the struggle to overcome conflict we become disillusioned, we enter into darkness or, being in conflict, we try to find escapes in various forms. If thought-feeling is caught neither in disillusionment nor in comforting refuge then conflict will find the means of its own ending. Conflict produces disillusionment or the desire to escape, for we are unwilling to think out, feel out all the implications involved in it; we are lazy, too conditioned to change, accepting authority and the easy way of life. To understand conflict and to be able to examine it with freedom, there must be a certain disinterested tranquillity. But when we are in conflict or in sorrow our instinctive response is to escape from it, to run away from its cause, not to face its hidden significance; so we seek various channels of escape: activity, amusement, gods, war. So distractions multiply; they become more important than the cause of sorrow itself; we then become intolerant of the means of escape of others and try to modify or reform them, but conflict and sorrow continue.

Now is conflict necessary for understanding? Is understanding the result of growth? Do we not mean by growth the constant becoming of the self, accumulating and renouncing, being greedy and becoming non-greedy, the endless process of becoming? The very nature of the self is to create contradiction. Is conflict between the opposites growth bringing with it understanding? Does the struggle in the endless corridor of the opposites lead anywhere except to further conflict and sorrow?

There is no end to conflict and sorrow in becoming. This

becoming leads to the conflict of contradiction in which most of us are caught; being caught in it, we think struggle and pain are inevitable, a necessary and evolutionary process. So time becomes an indispensable factor for growth, for further becoming. In this spiral of becoming there is no end to strife and pain. So our problem is how to put an end to them. Thought-feeling must go beyond and above the pattern of duality; that is, when there is conflict and pain, live with it unconditionally without escaping; to escape is to compare, to justify, to condemn; to be aware of sorrow is not to seek a refuge, an alleviation, but to be aware of the ways of thought-feeling. So when there is understanding of the futility of refuge, of escape, then that very sorrow creates the necessary flame that will consume it. Tranquillity of understanding is needed to transcend sorrow, not the conflict and pain of becoming. When the self is not occupied with its own becoming there is an unpremeditated clarity, a deep ecstasy. This intensity of joy is the outcome of the abandonment of the self.

Questioner: I have struggled for many, many years with a personal problem. I am still struggling. What am I to do?

Krishnamurti: What is the process of understanding a problem? To understand, mind-heart must unburden itself of its accumulation so that it is capable of right perception. If you would understand a modern painting you must, if you can, put aside your classical training, your prejudices, your trained responses. Similarly if we want to understand a complex psychological problem we must be capable of examining it without any condemnatory or favourable bias; we must be capable of approaching it with dispassion and freshness.

The questioner says that he has been struggling for many years with his problem. In his struggle he has accumulated what he would call experience, knowledge, and with this increasing burden he tries to solve the problem; thus he has never come face to face with it openly, anew, but has always approached it with the accumulation of many years. It is the accumulated memory that confronts the problem and so there is no understanding of it. The dead past darkens the ever living present.

Most of us are driven by some passion and are unaware of it, but if we are, we generally justify or condone it. But if it is a passion which we desire to transcend, we generally struggle with it, try to conquer or suppress it. In trying to overcome it we have not understood it, in trying to suppress it we have not transcended it. The passion still remains or it has taken another form which is still the cause of conflict and sorrow. This constant and continuous struggle does not bring understanding but only strengthens conflict, burdening the mind-heart with accumulated memory. But if we can delve deeply into it and die to it or come anew to it without the burden of yesterday, then we can comprehend it. Because our mind-heart is alert and keen, deeply aware and still, the problem is transcended.

If we can approach our problem without judging, without identifying, then the causes that lie behind it are revealed. If we would understand a problem we must set aside our desires, our accumulated experiences, our patterns of thought. The difficulty is not in the problem itself but in our approach to it. The scars of yesterday prevent the right approach. Conditioning translates the problem according to its own pattern, which in no way liberates

thought-feeling from the struggle and pain of the problem. To translate the problem is not to understand it; to understand it and so transcend it interpretation must cease. What is fully, completely understood leaves no trace as memory.

Questioner: I am intensely lonely. I seem to be in constant conflict in my relationships on account of this loneliness. It is a disease and must be healed. Can you help me, please, to heal it?

Krishnamurti: The present chaos, misery, is a product of this aching loneliness, void, for thought itself has become empty, without significance. Wars and increasing confusion are the outcome of our empty lives and activities.

Whether we are conscious of it or not, most of us are lonely; the more we are aware of it the more intense, burning and painful it becomes. The immature are easily satisfied in their emptiness but the more one is aware the greater is this problem. There is no escape from aching loneliness, nor is it to be overcome by thoughtlessness, by ignorance; ignorance, like superstition, yields a certain gratification but this only furthers conflict and sorrow. Most of us are intensely lonely and the anguish is penetrating and dulls the mind-heart. Its engulfing sorrow seems to spread endlessly and we seek constantly to escape from it, to cover it up, to fill this aching void consciously or unconsciously with hope and faith, with amusement and distraction. We try to cover up its anguish through activity, through the pleasure of knowledge, of belief, and of every form of addiction, religious and worldly. Our search for a refuge, for a comfort from this pain is endless; things, relationships and knowledge are means of escape from the persistent anguish of loneliness. The movement from one escape to another is

considered advancement; we condemn the man who fills this void with drink and amusement but the man who seeks a permanent escape, calling it noble, we consider worthy, spiritual.

Is there any enduring escape from this emptiness? We try various ways to fill the void but again and again we become aware of it. Do not all remedies however noble and gratifying merely avoid the problem? You may find temporary relief but anguish soon returns.

To find the right and lasting answer to loneliness we must first cease to run away from it, and this is very difficult for thought is ever seeking a refuge, an escape. It is only when the mind-heart can accept this void unconditionally, yielding to it without any motive, without any hope or fear, that there can be its transformation.

If you would truly understand the problem of loneliness and its greatness the values of the world must be set aside for they are distractions from the Real. These distractions and their values are the outcome of your desire to escape from your own emptiness and so they, too, are empty. Only when the mind-heart is stripped of all its pretensions and formulations can this aching emptiness be transcended.

Questioner: I have had what might be called a spiritual experience, a guidance, or a certain realization. how am I to deal with it?

Krishnamurti: Most of us have had deep experiences, call them by what name you will; we have had experiences of great ecstasy, of great vision, of great love. The experience fills our being with its light, with its breath; but it is not abiding, it passes away, leaving



its perfume.

With most of us the mind-heart is not capable of being open to that ecstasy. The experience was accidental, uninvited, too great for the mind-heart. The experience is greater than the experiencer and so the experiencer sets about to reduce it to his own level, to his sphere of comprehension. His mind is not still; it is active, noisy, rearranging; it must "deal" with the experience; it must organize it; it must spread it; it must tell others of its beauty. So the mind reduces the inexpressible into a pattern of authority or a direction for conduct. It interprets and translates the experience and so enmeshes it in its own triviality. Because the mind-heart does not know how to sing it pursues instead the singer.

The interpreter, the translator of the experience, must be as deep and wide as the experience itself if he would understand it; since he is not, he must cease to interpret it; to cease, he must be mature, wise in his understanding. You may have a significant experience but how you understand it, how you interpret it depends on you the interpreter; if your mind-heart is small, limited, then you translate the experience according to your own conditioning. It is this conditioning that must be understood and broken down before you can hope to grasp the full significance of the experience.

The maturity of mind-heart comes as it frees itself from its own limitations and not through clinging to the memory of a spiritual experience. If it clings to memory it abides with death, not with life. Deep experience may open the door to understanding, to self-knowledge and right thinking, but with many it becomes only a stirring stimulation, a memory, and soon loses its vital significance, preventing further experience.

We translate all experience in terms of our own conditioning, the deeper it is the more alertly aware must we be not to misread it. Deep and spiritual experiences are rare and if we have such experiences we reduce them to the petty level of our own mind and heart. If you are a Christian or a Hindu or a non-believer you accordingly translate such experiences, reducing them to the level of your own conditioning. If your mind-heart is given over to nationalism and greed, to passion and ill will, then such experiences will be used to further the slaughter of your neighbour; then you seek guidance to bomb your brother; then to worship is to destroy or torture those who are not of your country, of your faith.

It is essential to be aware of your conditioning rather than to try to "do something" about the experience itself, but mind-heart clings to the experiences of yesterday and so becomes incapable of understanding the living present.

## OJAI 7TH PUBLIC TALK 1945

Existence is painful and complex. To understand the sorrow of our existence we must think-feel anew, we must approach life simply and directly; if we can, we must begin each day anew. We must be able each day to revalue the ideals and patterns that we have brought into being. Life can be deeply and truly understood only as it exists in each one; you are that life and without comprehending it there can be no enduring joy and tranquillity.

Our conflict within and without arises, does it not, from the changing and contradictory values based on pleasure and pain? Our struggle lies in trying to find a value that is wholly satisfying, unvarying and un-disturbing; we are seeking permanent value that will ever gratify without any shadow of doubt or pain. Our constant struggle is based on this demand for lasting security; we crave security in things, in relationship, in thought.

Without understanding the problem of insecurity there is no security. If we seek security we shall not find it; the search for security brings its own destruction. There must be insecurity for the comprehension of Reality, the insecurity that is not the opposite of security. A mind that is well anchored, which feels safe in some refuge, can never understand Reality. The craving for security breeds slothfulness; it makes the mind-heart unliable and insensitive, fearful and dull; it hinders the vulnerability to Reality. In deep insecurity is Truth realized.

But we need a certain security to live; we need food, clothes and shelter, without which existence is not possible. It would be a comparatively simple matter to organize and distribute effectively

if we were satisfied with our daily fundamental needs only. Then there would be no individual, no national assertiveness, competitive expansion and ruthlessness; there would be no need for separate sovereign governments; there would be no wars if we were wholly satisfied with our daily needs. But we are not.

Yet why is it not possible to organize our needs? It is not possible because of the incessant conflict of our daily life with its greed, cruelty, hatred. It is not possible because we use our needs as a means of gratifying our psychological demands. Being inwardly uncreative, empty, destructive, we use our needs as a means of escape; so needs assume far greater significance than they really have. Psychologically they become all important; so sensate values assume great significance; property, name, talent, become the means for position, power, domination. Over things made by hand or by mind we are ever in conflict; hence economic planning for existence becomes the dominating problem. We crave for things which create the illusion of security and comfort but which bring us only conflict, confusion and antagonism. We lose in the security of things made by the mind that joy of creative Reality, the very nature of which is insecurity. A mind that is seeking security is ever in fear; it can never be joyous, it can never know creative being. The highest form of thinking-feeling is negative comprehension and its very basis is insecurity.

The more we consider the world without understanding our psychological cravings, demands and conflicts, the more complex and insoluble the problem of existence becomes. The more we plan and organize our economic existence without understanding and transcending the inner passions, fears, envies, the more conflict and

confusion will come into being. Contentment with little comes with the understanding of our psychological problems, not through legislation or the determined effort to possess little. We must eliminate intelligently those psychological demands which find gratification in things, in position, in capacity. If we do not seek power and domination, if we are not self-assertive, there will be peace; but as long as we are using things, relationship or ideas as means to gratify our ever increasing psychological cravings, so long will there be contention and misery. With the freedom from craving there comes right thinking and right thinking alone can bring tranquillity.

Questioner: I come from a part of the world which has suffered terribly in this war. I see around me widespread hunger, disease, and a great danger of civil war and bloodshed unless these problems are tackled immediately. I feel it my duty to make my contribution to their solution. On the other hand I see in the world of today the need for a point of view like yours. Is it possible for me to pursue my first objective without neglecting the second? In other words, how can I continue the two?

Krishnamurti: Only in the search of the Real can there be an enduring solution to our problems. To separate existence from the Real is to continue in ignorance and sorrow. To grapple with the problems of hunger, mass murder and destruction on their own planes, is to further misery and catastrophe. In the search of the Real the world's problem which is the individual problem will find a lasting answer. But if you are only concerned with the reorganization of greed, ill will and ignorance there will be no end to confusion and antagonism.

If the reformer, the contributor to the solution of the world's problems, has not radically transformed himself, if he has had no inner revolution of values then what he contributes will only add further to conflict and misery. He who is eager to reform the world must first understand himself for he is the world. The present misery and degradation of man is brought on by man himself and if he merely plans to reform the pattern of conflict without fundamentally understanding himself he will only increase ignorance and sorrow. If each one seeks eternal value then there will be an end to the conflict within and so peace will come into the world; then only will those causes that perpetuate antagonism, confusion and misery cease.

If you want to put an end to the conflict, confusion and misery with which we are confronted everywhere, from where are you to begin? Are you to begin with the world, with the outer, and try to rearrange its values while maintaining your own nationalism, acquisitiveness and hatred, religious dogma and superstition? Or must you begin with yourself to eliminate drastically those causes that produce conflict and sorrow? If you are able to set aside the passion and worldliness on which present culture is built, then you will discover and experience eternal value which is never within any framework; then you might be able to help others free themselves from bondage. We desire, unfortunately, to combine the eternal with a whole series of values which lead to antagonism, conflict and misery. If you would seek Truth you must abandon those values that are based on sensation and gratification, on passion and ill will, possessiveness and greed. You need not let your lives be guided by economists, by politicians and priests with

their endless plans for peace; they have led you to death and destruction. You have made them your leaders but now, with deep awareness, you must become responsible for yourself for within you is the cause and the solution of all conflict and sorrow. You created it and you alone can free yourself, not another can save you.

Therefore our first duty, if one may use that word, is to search out the Real which alone can bring peace and joy. In it alone is there enduring unity of man; in it alone can conflict and sorrow cease; in it alone is there creative being. Without this inward treasure the outward organization of law and economic planning have little significance. With the awareness of the Real the outer and inner cease to be separate.

Questioner: I have tried to meditate along the lines you suggested last year. I have gone into it fairly deeply. I feel that meditation and dreams have a relationship. What do you think?

Krishnamurti: For those who practice meditation, it is a process of becoming, of building up, of denying or of imitating, of concentration, of narrowing down thought-feeling. They either cultivate virtue as a means towards a formulated end, or try to focus their wandering attention on a saint, a teacher, or an idea. Many use various techniques to go beyond the reach of the means, but the means shape the mind-heart, and so in the end they become slaves to the means. The means and the end are not different, they are not separate. If you are seeking an end you will find the means for it, but such an end is not the Real. The Real comes into being, you cannot seek it; it must come, you cannot induce it. But meditation as generally practised is craving to become or not to

become; it is a subtle form of self-expansion, self-assertiveness; and so it becomes merely a series of struggles within the pattern of duality. The effort of becoming, positively or negatively, on different levels does not put an end to conflict; only with the cessation of craving is there tranquillity.

If the meditator does not know himself his meditation is of little value and becomes even a hindrance to comprehension. Without self-knowledge meditation is not possible, and without meditative awareness there is no self-knowledge. If I do not understand myself, my cravings, my motives, my contradictions, how can I comprehend truth? If I am not aware of my contradictory states, if I am passionate, ignorant, greedy, envious, meditation only strengthens the self-enclosing process; without self-knowledge there is no foundation for right thinking; without right thinking thought-feeling cannot transcend itself.

A lady once said that she had practised meditation for a number of years and presently went on to explain that a certain group of people must be destroyed for they were bringing misery and destruction to man. Yet she practised brotherhood, love and peace, which she said had guided her life. Do not many of you who practice meditation talk of love and brotherhood, yet condone or participate in war which is organized murder? What significance then has your meditation? Your meditation only strengthens your own narrowness, ill will and ignorance.

Those who would understand the deep significance of meditation must begin first with themselves, for self-knowledge is the foundation of right thinking. Without right thinking how can thought go far? You must begin near to go far. Self-awareness is



arduous; to think-out, feel-out every thought-feeling is strenuous; but this awareness of every thought-feeling will bring to an end the wandering of the mind. When you try to meditate do you not find that your mind wanders and chatters ceaselessly? It is of little use to brush aside every thought but one and try to concentrate upon that one thought which you have chosen. Instead of trying to control these wandering thoughts become aware of them, think-out, feel-out every thought, comprehend its significance, however pleasant or unpleasant; try to understand each thought-feeling. Each thought-feeling so pursued will yield its meaning and thus the mind, as it comprehends its own repetitive and wandering thoughts, becomes emptied of its own formulations.

The mind is the result of the past, it is a storehouse of many interests, of contradictory values; it is ever gathering, ever becoming. We must be aware of these accumulations and understand them as they arise. Suppose you have collected letters for many years; now you look into the drawer and read letter after letter, keeping some and discarding others; what you keep you reread and again you discard till the drawer is empty. Similarly, be aware of every thought-feeling, comprehend its significance, and should it return reconsider it for it has not been fully understood. As a drawer is useful only when empty so the mind must be free of all its accumulations for only then can there be that openness to wisdom and the ecstasy of the Real. Tranquillity of wisdom is not the result of an act of will, it is not a conclusion, a state to be achieved. It comes into being in the awareness of understanding.

Meditation becomes significant when the mind-heart is aware, thinking-out, feeling-out every thought-feeling that arises without

comparison or identification. For identification and comparison maintain the conflict of duality and there is no solution within its pattern. I wonder how many of you have really practised meditation? If you have, you will have noticed how difficult it is to be extensively aware without the narrowing down of thought-feeling. In trying to concentrate, the conflicting thoughts-feelings are suppressed or pushed aside or overcome and through this process there can be no understanding. Concentration is gained at the expense of deep awareness. If the mind is petty and limited, concentration will not make it any the less small and trivial; on the contrary it will strengthen its own nature. Such narrow concentration does not make the mind-heart vulnerable to Reality; it only hardens the mind-heart in its own obstinacy and ignorance and perpetuates the self-enclosing process.

When the mind-heart is extensive, deep and tranquil there is the Real. If the mind is seeking a result, however noble and worthy, if it is concerned with becoming it ceases to be extensive and infinitely pliable. It must be as the unknown to receive the Unknowable. It must be utterly tranquil for the being of the Eternal.

So the mind must understand every value it has accumulated and in this process the many layers of consciousness, both the open and the hidden, are uncovered and understood. The more there is an awareness of the conscious layers the more the hidden layers come to the surface; if the conscious layers are confused and disturbed then the deeper layers of consciousness cannot project themselves into the conscious, save through dreams.

Awareness is the process of freeing the conscious mind from

the bondages which cause conflict and pain and thus making it open and receptive to the hidden. The hidden layers of consciousness convey their significance through dreams and symbols. If every thought-feeling is thought-out, felt-out, as fully and deeply as possible, without condemnation or comparison, acceptance or identification, then all the hidden layers of consciousness will reveal themselves. Through constant awareness the dreamer ceases to dream, for through alert and passive awareness every movement of thought-feeling of the open and hidden layers of consciousness is being understood. But if one is incapable of thinking-out, feeling-out every thought completely and fully then one begins to dream. Dreams need interpretation and to interpret there must be free and open intelligence; instead, the dreamer goes to a dream specialist, thus creating for himself other problems. Only in deep extensive awareness can there be an end to dreams and their anxious interpretation.

Right meditation is very effective in freeing the mind-heart from its self-enclosing process. The open and hidden layers of consciousness are the result of the past, of accumulation, of centuries of education, and surely such an educated, conditioned mind cannot be vulnerable to the Real. Occasionally, in the still silence after the storm of conflict and pain, there comes inexpressible beauty and joy; it is not the result of the storm but of the cessation of conflict. The mind-heart must be passively still for the creative being of the Real.

Questioner: Will you please explain the idea that one must die each day, or that one must live the four seasons in a day?

Krishnamurti: Is it not essential that there should be a constant

renewal, a rebirth? If the present is burdened with the experience of yesterday there can be no renewal. Renewal is not the action of birth and death; it is beyond the opposites; only freedom from the accumulation of memory brings renewal and there is no understanding save in the present.

Mind can understand the present only if it does not compare, judge; the desire to alter or condemn the present without understanding it gives continuance to the past. Only in comprehending the reflection of the past in the mirror of the present, without distortion, is there renewal.

The accumulation of memory is called knowledge; with this burden, with the scars of experience, thought is ever interpreting the present and so giving continuity to its own scars and conditioning. This continuity is time-binding and so there is no rebirth, no renewal. If you have lived an experience fully, completely, have you not found that it leaves no traces behind? It is only the incomplete experiences that leave their mark, giving continuity to self-identified memory. We consider the present as a means to an end, so the present loses its immense significance. The present is the Eternal. But how can a mind that is made up, put together, understand that which is not put together, which is beyond all value, the Eternal? As each experience arises live it out as fully and deeply as possible; think it out, feel it out extensively and profoundly; be aware of its pain and pleasure, of your judgments and identifications. Only when experience is completed is there a renewal. We must be capable of living the four seasons in a day; to be keenly aware, to experience, to understand and be free of the gatherings of each day. With the end of each day the mind-

heart must empty itself of the accumulation of its pleasures and pains. We gather consciously and unconsciously; it is comparatively easy to discard what has been consciously acquired but it is more difficult for thought to free itself from the unconscious accumulations, the past, the incompleting experiences with their recurring memories. Thought-feeling clings so tenaciously to what it has gathered because it is afraid to be insecure.

Meditation is renewal, the dying each day to the past; it is an intense passive awareness, the burning away of the desire to continue, to become. As long as mind-heart is self-protecting there will be continuity without renewal. Only when the mind ceases to create is there creation.

Questioner: How would you cope with an incurable disease?

Krishnamurti: Most of us do not understand ourselves, our various tensions and conflicts, our hopes and fears, which often produce mental and physical disorders.

Of primary importance is psychological understanding and well being of the mind-heart, which then can deal with the accidents of disease. As a tool wears out so does the body, but those who cling to sensory values find this wasting away to be a sorrow beyond measure; they live for sensation and gratification and the fear of death and pain drives them to delusion. As long as thought-feeling is predominantly sensate there will be no end to delusion and fear; the world in its very nature being a distraction it is essential that the problem of delusion and health be approached patiently and wisely.

If we are organically diseased then let us cope with this

condition as with all mechanism, in the best way possible. The psychological delusions, tensions, conflicts, maladjustments produce greater misery than organic disease. We try to eradicate symptoms rather than cause; the cause itself may be sense value. There is no end to the gratification of the senses which only creates greater and greater turmoil, tension, fear and so on; such a living must culminate in mental and physical disorder or in war. Unless there is a radical change in value there will and must be ever increasing disharmony within, and so, without. This radical change in value must be brought about through understanding the psychological being; if you do not change, your delusions and ill health will inevitably increase; you will become unbalanced, depressed, giving continuous employment to physicians. If there is no deep revolution of values then disease and delusion become a distraction, an escape, giving opportunity for self-indulgence. We can unconditionally accept an incurable disease only when thought-feeling is able to transcend the value of time.

The predominance of sensory values cannot bring sanity and health. There must be a cleansing of the mind-heart which cannot be done by any outer agency. There must be self-awareness, a psychological tension. Tension is not necessarily harmful; there must be right exertion of the mind. It is only when tension is not properly utilized that it leads to psychological difficulties and delusions, to ill health and perversions. Tension of the right kind is essential for understanding; to be alertly and passively aware is to give full attention without the conflict of opposition. Only when this tension is not properly understood does it lead to difficulty; living, relationship, thought demand heightened sensitivity, a right

tension. We are conscious of this tension and generally misread or avoid it thus preventing the understanding that it would bring.

Tension or sensitivity can heal or destroy.

Life is complex and painful, a series of inner and outer conflicts. There must be an awareness of the mental and emotional attitudes which cause outward and physical disturbances. To understand them you must have time for quiet reflection; to be aware of your psychological states there must be periods of quiet solitude, a withdrawal from the noise and bustle of daily life and its routine. This active stillness is essential not only for the well being of the mind-heart but for the discovery of the Real without which physical or moral well being is of little significance.

Unfortunately most of us give little time to serious and quiet self-recollectedness. We allow ourselves to become mechanical, thoughtlessly following routine, accepting and being driven by authority; we become mere cogs in the vast machine of the present culture. We have lost creativeness; there is no inward joy. What we are inwardly that we project outwardly. Mere cultivation of the outer does not bring about inward well being; only through constant self-awareness and self-knowledge can there be inward tranquillity. Without the Real, existence is conflict and pain.

## OJAI 8TH PUBLIC TALK 1945

The problem of relationship is not easily comprehended, it requires patience and pliability of mind-heart; mere adjustment or conformity to a system of conduct does not bring about the understanding of relationship; such adjustment and conformity cloud and intensify the struggle. If we would deeply comprehend relationship it must be approached afresh each day, without the scars or memories of yesterday's experiences. These conflicts in relationship build a wall of continuous resistance and instead of bringing wider and deeper unity create insurmountable differences and disunity.

As you would read an interesting book without skipping a page, so relationship must be studied and understood; the solution to the problem of relationship is not to be found outside of it but in it; the answer is not at the end of the book but is to be found in the manner of our approach to relationship. How you read the book of relationship is of far greater importance than the answer, or the overcoming of the struggle that exists in it. It must be approached every day anew without the burden of yesterday; it is this liberation from yesterday, from time, that brings creative understanding.

To be is to be related; there is no such thing as isolated being. Relationship is a conflict within and without; the inward conflict extended becomes world conflict. You and the world are not separate; your problem is the world's problem; you bear the world in you; without you it is not. There is no isolation and there is no object that is not related. This conflict must be understood not as a problem of the part but of the whole.



You are aware, are you not, of conflict in relationship, of the constant struggle between you and another, between you and the world? Why is there conflict in relationship? Does it not arise because of the interaction of dependency and conformity, of domination and possessiveness? We conform, we depend, we possess because of inward insufficiency which gives rise to fear. Do we not know this fear in intimate, close relationship? Relationship is a tension, and deep awareness is necessary to understand it.

Why do we crave to possess or dominate? Is it not because of the fear of insufficiency? Being fearful we long to be secure; emotionally and mentally we desire to be safe and well anchored in things, in people, in ideas. Inwardly we crave security which express outwardly in dependency, conformity, possessiveness and so on. It is the burning and seemingly ceaseless void that drives us to find a refuge, a hope, in relationship, and we confuse the urge to avoid our anguish of loneliness with love, duty, responsibility.

But what is the true significance of relationship? Is it not a process of self-revelation? Is not relationship a mirror in which, if we are aware, we can observe without distortion our private thoughts and motives, our inward state? In relationship the subtle process of the self, of the ego, is revealed and through choiceless awareness alone can inward insufficiency be transcended. Conflict ceases in the aloneness of Reality. This transcending is love. Love has no motive; it is its own eternity.

Questioner: How can I become integrated?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by integration? Does it not mean to be made whole, to be without conflict and sorrow?

Most of us try to be integrated within the superficial layers of our consciousness; we try to integrate ourselves so as to function normally within the pattern of society; we desire to fit into an environment which we accept as being normal; but we do not question the significance or the value of the social structure about us. Conformity to a pattern is considered integration; education and organized religion aid us towards this conformity.

Has not integration a deeper significance than mere adjustment to society and its patterns? Is conformity integration? Is not integration pure being and not just the satisfaction of our desire to be made whole, to become normal? The motive behind the urge for integration is surely of great significance.

The urge for integration may arise from ambition, from the desire for power, from the fear of insufficiency and so on. Coordination is necessary to achieve a result, but consider what is involved in the idea of attainment of desire; self-assertiveness, envy, enmity, the pettiness of success, strife and pain. Some people suppress the craving for worldly success but indulge in the craving to become virtuous, to be a Master, to attain spiritual glory, but the craving to become ever leads to conflict, confusion and antagonism. This again is not true integration. True integration comes when there is awareness and so understanding through all layers of consciousness. Our superficial consciousness is the result of education, of influence and only when thought transcends its own self-created limitation can there be true integration. The many opposing and contradictory parts of our consciousness can be integrated only when the creator of these divisions ceases to be; within the pattern of the self there can be only conflict, there can

never be integration, completeness.

Integration comes with the freedom from craving. It is not an end in itself but if you seek self-knowledge, ever deeply, then integration becomes the way to Reality.

Questioner: You may be wise about some things but why are you, as it has been represented to me, against organization? Would you please explain why you consider it a hindrance in our search for Reality? Krishnamurti: Why do we organize? Is it not for efficiency? We organize our existence in order to live; we can organize our thought-feeling so as to make it efficient but efficient for what? For killing, oppressing, gaining power?

If certain ideas, beliefs, doctrines appeal to you, you join with others to spread effectively what you believe and for this you create an organization. But is the understanding of Reality the result of propaganda, organized belief, enforced or subtle conformity? Is Reality discovered through the doctrines of churches, cults or sects? Is Reality to be found through compulsion, through imitation?

We think, do we not, that through conformity, through formulation of beliefs we shall know the Real? Must not thought-feeling transcend all conditioning to discover the Real? Thought-feeling now experiences that in which it is educated, in which it believes, but such experience is limited and narrow; such a mind cannot experience the Real. Conformity can be organized efficiently; adherence to a formula, to a doctrine can be effectively manipulated but will that lead to Reality? Does not Reality come into being when there is complete liberation from all authority, from all compulsion and imitation? This state of being we

experience only when thought is utterly still. Only in freedom is there the experience of the Real.

Regimentation of thought-feeling in the name of religion, peace and freedom is made attractive and acceptable; your tendency is to accept authority; you desire to be led; you look to others to direct your conduct. The radio, movies, newspapers, governments, churches are moulding your thought and feeling, and because you desire to conform their task becomes easy. Your craving for security creates fear and it is fear that yields to the oppression of authority; fear forces you not how to think but what to think. Only in freedom from fear is there the discovery of the Real.

Group effort, without conforming to authority, could be very significant through the revelation of inward individual motives and purposes; the group could mirror the activities of the self and through relationship awaken self-awareness. But if the group is used for self-assertiveness through propaganda or as a means of escape then it can become a hindrance to the discovery of Truth.

Creativeness comes into being when thought-feeling is not held within any pattern, within any formulation. The self is the result of conformity, of conditioning, of accumulated memory; so the self is never free to discover; it can only expand in its own conditioning and organize itself to be efficient and subtle in its assertiveness, pursuits and demands, but it can never be free. Only when the self ceases to become is there the Real. To be free to discover, the memory of yesterday must cease; it is the burden of the past that gives continuity and continuity is conformity. Do not conform in order to be free for this does not bring freedom and in freedom alone is there creative being. Freedom cannot be organized and

when it ceases to be freedom. We try to enclose the living Truth in gratifying patterns of thought-feeling and thereby destroy it.

Questioner: I would like to ask you if the Masters are not a great source of inspiration to us. As life is unequal there must be Master and pupil, surely?

Krishnamurti: Is not this inequality the result of ignorance? Does not this division of man into the high and low deny the Real? Is not this domination and submission of man the outcome of ignorance and thoughtlessness?

Our social structure is built upon division and difference of levels of the clerk and the executive, the general and the soldier, the bishop and the priest, the one who knows and the one who does not know. This division is based on sensate value, which sets man against man. This social pattern breeds endless opposition and antagonism and there can be an end to conflict within this pattern only when thought-feeling transcends greed, ill will and ignorance.

With our acquisitive and competitive mentality we try to grasp Reality and build a ladder for achievement; we create the high and the low, the Master and the pupil. We think of Reality as an end to be achieved, as a reward for righteousness; we think it is to be attained through time, and so maintain the constant division between Master and pupil, the successful and the ignorant.

The wise, the compassionate do not think of man in terms of division; the foolish are caught up in the social and religious division of man. Those who are conscious of this division and know it to be false and stupid overcome it but yet they persist in division with regard to those they call Masters. If you perceive the

misery in this sensate world caused by the division of man into the high and the low, why then are you not aware of it on all planes of existence? In the sensate world the division of man against man is the result of greed and ignorance and it is also greed and ignorance that create the follower and the leader, the Master and the pupil, the liberated and the unenlightened.

The questioner asks if a Master or a saint is not a source of inspiration. When you draw inspiration from another it is only a distraction, hence uncreative and illusory. Inspiration is sought in many ways but invariably it breeds dependence and fear. Fear prevents understanding, it puts an end to communion, it is a living death.

Is not the creative being of Reality the norm? You look to others for hope and guidance because you are empty and poor; you turn to books, to pictures, to teachers, to gurus, to saviours to inspire and strengthen you, you are ever in hunger, ever seeking but never finding. In the creative being of Reality alone is there the cessation of conflict and sorrow. But separation and inequality will be maintained as long as there is a becoming; as long as the pupil craves to become a Master. This craving to become is born of ignorance for the present is the Eternal. Only in the aloneness of Reality is there completeness; in that flame of creative being there is no other but the One.

Through right means only can Reality be discovered for the means is the end; the means and the end are inseparable; through self-awareness and self-knowledge there is the flame of Reality. It does not lie through another but through your own awakened thought. None can lead you to it; none can deliver you from your

own sorrow. The authority of another is blinding; only in utter freedom is the Supreme to be found. Let us live in time timelessly.

Questioner: Do you believe in progress?

Krishnamurti: There is the movement of so-called progression, is there not, from the simple to the complex? There is the process of constant adjustment to environment which brings about modification or change, taking on new forms. There is constant interaction between the outer and the inner, each aiding in modifying and transforming the other. This does not demand belief; we can observe society becoming more and more complex, more and more efficiently organized to survive, to exploit, to oppress and to kill. Existence which was simple and primitive has become very complex, highly organized and civilized. We have "progressed; we have radios, movies, quick means of transportation and all the rest of it. We can kill, instead of a few, thousands upon thousands in a moment; we can wipe out, as the phrase goes, whole cities and their people in a few burning seconds. We are well aware of all this and some call it progress; bigger and better houses, more luxury, more amusements, more distractions. Can this be considered progress? Is the expansion of sensate desire progress? Or does progress lie in compassion?

We mean by progress also, do we not, the constant expanding of desire, of the self? Now in this process of expansion and becoming can there ever be an end to conflict and sorrow? If not, what is the purpose of becoming? If it is for the continuation of struggle and pain, of what value is progress, the evolution of desire, the expansion of the self? If in the expansion of desire there is the cessation of sorrow then becoming could have significance, but is

it not the very nature of craving to create and continue conflict and sorrow?

The self, the I, this bundle of memories, is the result of the past, the product of time, and will this self, however much it may evolve, experience the Timeless? Can the I, becoming greater, nobler through time, experience the Real?

Can the I, the accumulated memory, know freedom? Can the self which is craving, and so the cause of ignorance and conflict, know enlightenment? Only in freedom can there be enlightenment, not in the bondage and pain of craving. As long as the I thinks of itself as gaining and losing, becoming and not becoming, thought is time-bound. Thought held in the bondage of yesterday, of time, can never experience the Timeless.

We think in terms of yesterday, today and tomorrow; I was, I am and I will become. We think-feel in terms of accumulation; we are constantly creating and maintaining the idea of time, of continual becoming. Is not being wholly different from becoming? We can only be when we understand the process and significance of becoming. If we would deeply understand we must be silent, must we not? The very greatness of a problem calls for silence as does beauty. But, you will be asking, how am I to become silent, how am I to stop this incessant chattering of the mind? There is no becoming silent; there is or there is not silence. If you are aware of the immensity of being then there is silence; its very intensity brings tranquillity.

Character can be modified, changed, made harmonious, but character is not Reality. Thought must transcend itself to comprehend the Timeless. When we think of progress, growth, are



we not thinking-feeling within the pattern of time? There is a becoming, modifying or changing in the horizontal process; this becoming knows pain and sorrow but will this lead to Reality? It cannot for becoming is ever time-binding. It is only when thought frees itself from becoming, liberates itself from the past through diligent self-awareness, is utterly tranquil, that there is the Timeless.

This tranquillity of understanding is not produced by an act of will for will is still a part of becoming, of craving. Mind-heart can be tranquil only when the storm and the conflict of craving have ceased. As a lake is calm when the winds stop, so the mind is tranquil in wisdom when it understands and transcends its own craving and distraction. This craving is to be understood as it is disclosed in every day thought-feeling-action; through constant self-awareness are the ways of craving, self-becoming, understood and transcended. Do not depend on time but be arduous in the search of self-knowledge.

Questioner: In answering the question of how to solve a psychological problem lastingly, you spoke about the three consecutive phases in the process of solving such a problem, the first one being the consideration of its cause and effect; secondly, the understanding of that particular problem as part of the dualistic conflict; and then the discovery that the thinker and the thought are one. It seems to me that the first and second steps are comparatively easy, while the third level cannot be attained in a similar simple, logical progression. Krishnamurti: I wonder if you have observed for yourself the three phases I suggested in trying to solve a psychological problem? Most of us can be aware of the

cause and effect of a problem and also be aware of its dualistic conflict, but the questioner feels that the last step, the discovery that the thinker and the thought are one, is not so easy nor can it be understood logically. These three states or steps I suggested only for the convenience of verbal communication; they flow from one to the other; they are not fixed within a framework of different levels. It is really important to understand they are not different stages, one superior to the other; they hang on the same thread of understanding. There is an interrelationship between cause and effect and the dualistic conflict and the discovery that the thinker and his thought are one.

Cause and effect are inseparable; in the cause is the effect. To be aware of the cause-effect of a problem needs certain swift pliability of mind-heart for the cause-effect is constantly being modified, undergoing continual change. What once was cause-effect may have become modified now and to be aware of this modification or change is surely necessary for true understanding. To follow the ever changing cause-effect is strenuous for the mind clings and takes shelter in what was the cause-effect; it holds to conclusions and so conditions itself to the past. There must be an awareness of this cause-effect conditioning; it is not static but the mind is when it holds fast to a cause-effect that is immediately past. Karma is this bondage to cause-effect. As thought itself is the result of my causes effects it must extricate itself from its own bondages. The problem of cause-effect is not to be superficially observed and passed by. It is the continuous chain of conditioning memory that must be observed and understood; to be aware of this chain being created and to follow it through all the layers of

consciousness is arduous; yet it must be deeply searched out and understood.

So long as the thinker is concerned with his thought there must be dualism; as long as he struggles with his thoughts dualistic conflict will continue. Is there a solution for a problem in the conflict of opposites? Is not the maker of the problem more important than the problem itself? Thought can go above and beyond its dualistic conflict only when the thinker is not separate from his thought. If the thinker is acting upon his thought he will maintain himself apart and so ever be the cause of opposing conflict. In the conflict of dualism there is no answer to any problem for in that state the thinker is ever separate from his thought. Craving remains and yet the object of craving is constantly being changed; what is important is to understand craving itself, not the object of craving.

Is the thinker different from his thought? Are they not a joint phenomenon? Why does the thinker separate himself from his thought? Is it not for his own continuity? He is ever seeking security, permanency, and as thoughts are impermanent the thinker thinks of himself as the permanent. The thinker hides behind his thoughts and without transforming himself tries to change the frame of his thought. He conceals himself behind the activity of his thoughts to safeguard himself. He is ever the observer manipulating the observed, but he is the problem and not his thoughts. It is one of the subtle ways of the thinker to be troubled about his thoughts and thereby avoid his own transformation.

If the thinker separates his thought from himself and tries to modify it without radically transforming himself conflict and

delusion inevitably will follow. There is no way out of this conflict and illusion save through the transformation of the thinker himself. This complete integration of the thinker with his thought is not on the verbal level but is a profound experience which comes only when cause-effect is understood and the thinker is no longer caught in dualistic opposition. Through self-knowledge and right meditation the integration of the thinker with his thought takes place and then only can the thinker go above and beyond himself. Then only the thinker ceases to be. In right meditation the concentrator is the concentration; as generally practised the thinker is the concentrator, concentrating upon something or becoming something. In right meditation the thinker is not separate from his thought. On rare occasions we experience this integration in which the thinker has wholly ceased; then only is there creation, eternal being. Till the thinker is silent he is the maker of problems, of conflict and sorrow.

## OJAI 9TH PUBLIC TALK 1945

The desire to be secure in things and in relationship only brings about conflict and sorrow, dependence and fear; the search for happiness in relationship without understanding the cause of conflict leads to misery. When thought lays emphasis on sensate value and is dominated by it there can be only strife and pain. Without self-knowledge relationship becomes a source of struggle and antagonism, a device for covering up inward insufficiency, inward poverty.

Does not craving for security in any form indicate inward insufficiency? Does not this inner poverty make us seek, accept and cling to formulations, hopes, dogmas, beliefs, possessions; is not our action then merely imitative and compulsive? So anchored to ideology, belief, our thinking becomes merely a process of enchainment.

Our thought is conditioned by the past; the I, the me and the mine, is the result of stored up experience, ever incomplete. The memory of the past is always absorbing the present; the self which is memory of pleasure and pain is ever gathering and discarding, ever forging anew the chains of its own conditioning. It is building and destroying but always within its own self-created prison. To the pleasant memory it clings and the unpleasant it discards. Thought must transcend this conditioning for the being of the Real.

Is evaluating right thinking? Choice is conditioned thinking; right thinking comes through understanding the chooser, the censor. As long as thought is anchored in belief, in ideology, it can only function within its own limitation; it can only feel-act within

the boundaries of its own prejudices; it can only experience according to its own memories which give continuity to the self and its bondage. Conditioned thought prevents right thinking which is non-evaluation, non-identification.

There must be alert self-observation without choice; choice is evaluation and evaluation strengthens the self-identifying memory. If we wish to understand deeply there must be passive and choiceless awareness which allows experience to unfold itself and reveal its own significance. The mind that seeks security through the Real creates only illusion. The Real is not a refuge; it is not the reward for righteous action; it is not an end to be gained.

Questioner: Should we not doubt your experience and what you say? Though certain religions condemn doubt as a fetter is it not, as you have expressed it, a precious ointment a necessity?

Krishnamurti: Is it not important to find out why doubt ever arises at all? What is the cause of doubt? Does it not arise when there is the following of another? So the problem is not doubt but the cause of acceptance. Why do we accept, why do we follow?

We follow another's authority, another's experience and then doubt it; this search for authority and its sequel, disillusionment, is a painful process for most of us. We blame or criticize the once accepted authority, the leader, the teacher, but we do not examine our own craving for an authority who can direct our conduct. Once we understand this craving we shall comprehend the significance of doubt.

Is there not in us a deep rooted tendency to seek direction, to accept authority? Wherefrom does this urge in us come? Does it not arise from our own uncertainty, from our own incapacity to

know what is true at all times? We want another to chart for us the sea of self-knowledge; we desire to be secure, we desire to find a safe refuge and so we follow anyone who will direct us.

Uncertainty and fear seek guidance and compel obedience and worship of authority; tradition, education create for us many patterns of obedience. If sometimes we do not accept and obey symbols of outward authority we create our own inner authority, the subtle voice of our self. But through obedience freedom cannot be known; freedom comes with understanding, not through acceptance of authority nor through imitation.

The desire for self-expansion creates obedience and acceptance which in turn give rise to doubt. We conform and obey for we crave self-expansion and thus we become thoughtless. Acceptance leads to thoughtlessness and doubt. Experience, especially that called religious, gives us great joy and we use it as a guide, a reference; but when that experience ceases to sustain and inspire us we begin to doubt it. Doubt arises only when we accept. But is it not foolish, thoughtless to accept an experience of another? It is you who must think-out, feel-out and be vulnerable to the Real, but you cannot be open if you cover yourself with the cloak of authority, whether that of another or of your own creation. It is far more essential to understand the craving for authority, for direction, than to praise or dispel doubt. In comprehending the craving for direction doubt ceases. Doubt has no place in creative being.

He who clings to the past, to memory, is ever in conflict. Doubt does not put an end to conflict; only when craving is understood can there be the bliss of the Real. Beware of the man who says he

knows.

Questioner: I want to understand myself, I want to put an end to my stupid struggles and make a definite effort to live fully and truly.

Krishnamurti: What do you mean when you use the term myself? As you are many and ever changing is there an enduring moment when you can say that this is the ever me? It is the multiple entity, the bundle of memories that must be understood and not seemingly the one entity that calls itself the me.

We are everchanging contradictory thoughts-feelings: love and hate, peace and passion, intelligence and ignorance. Now which is the me in all of this? Shall I choose what is most pleasing and discard the rest? Who is it that must understand these contradictory and conflicting selves? Is there a permanent self, a spiritual entity apart from these? Is not that self also the continuing result of the conflict of many entities? Is there a self that is above and beyond all contradictory selves? The truth of it can be experienced only when the contradictory selves are understood and transcended.

All the conflicting entities which make up the me have also brought into being the other me, the observer, the analyser. To understand myself I must understand the many parts of myself including the I who has become the watcher, the I who understands. The thinker must not only understand his many contradictory thoughts but he must understand himself as the creator of these many entities. The I, the thinker, the observer watches his opposing and conflicting thoughts-feelings as though he were not part of them, as though he were above and beyond them, controlling, guiding, shaping. But is not the I, the thinker,



also these conflicts? Has he not created them? Whatever the level, is the thinker separate from his thoughts? The thinker is the creator of opposing urges, assuming different roles at different times according to his pleasure and pain. To comprehend himself the thinker must come upon himself through his many aspects. A tree is not just the flower and the fruit but is the total process. Similarly to understand myself I must without identification and choice be aware of the total process that is the me.

How can there be understanding when one part is used as a means of comprehending the other? Is it possible to understand one contradiction by another? There is understanding only when contradiction as a whole ceases, when thought is not identifying itself with the part.

So it is important to understand the desire to condemn or approve, to justify or compare for it is this desire that prevents the full comprehension of the whole being. Who is the judge, who is the entity that is comparing, analysing? Is he not an aspect only of the total process, an aspect of the self that is ever maintaining conflict? Conflict is not dissolved by introducing another entity who may represent condemnation, justification or love. In freedom alone can there be understanding but freedom is denied when the observer through identification condemns or justifies. Only in understanding the process as a whole can right thinking open the door to the Eternal.

Questioner: As you are so much against authority are there any unmistakable signs by which the liberation of another can be objectively recognized, apart from the personal affirmation of the individual regarding his own attainment?

Krishnamurti: It is again the problem of acceptance differently stated, is it not? Suppose one does assert that one is liberated, of what great significance is it to another? Suppose you are free from sorrow, of what importance is it to another? It becomes significant only if one seeks to free oneself from ignorance, for it is ignorance that causes sorrow. So the primary point is not who has attained but how to free thought from its self-enchaining sorrow. Most of us are not concerned with this essential issue but rather with outward signs by which we may recognize one who is liberated in order that he may heal our sorrows. We desire gain rather than understanding; our craving for guidance, for comfort, makes us accept authority and so we are ever seeking the expert. You are the cause of your sorrow and you alone can understand and transcend it, none can give you deliverance from ignorance save yourself.

It is not important who has attained but it is important to be aware of your attitude and how you listen to what is being said. We listen with hope and fear; we seek the light of another but are not alertly passive to be able to understand. If the liberated seems to fulfil our desires we accept him; if not, we continue our search for the one who will; what most of us desire is gratification at different levels. What is important is not how to recognize one who is liberated but how to understand yourself. No authority here or hereafter can give you knowledge of yourself; without self-knowledge there is no liberation from ignorance, from sorrow.

You are the creator of misery as you are the creator of ignorance and authority; you bring the leader into being and follow him; your craving fashions the pattern of your religious and worldly life so it is essential to understand yourself and so

transform the way of your life. Be aware of why you follow another, why you search out authority, why you crave direction in conduct; be aware of the ways of craving. The mind-heart has become insensitive through fear and gratification of authority but through deep awareness of thought-feeling comes the quickening of life. Through choiceless awareness the total process of your being is understood; through passive awareness comes enlightenment.

Questioner: Though you have answered several questions on meditation I find that you have not said anything about group meditation. Should one meditate with others or alone?

Krishnamurti: What is meditation? Is it not the understanding of the ways of the self, is it not self-knowledge? Without self-knowledge, without awareness of the total process that which you build into character, that which you strive for, has no reality. Self-knowledge is the very beginning of true meditation. Now will you understand yourself through being alone or with many? The many can be a hindrance to meditation as can also the being alone. The very weight of ignorance of the many who do not understand themselves can overpower one who is attempting to understand himself through meditation. The group can stimulate one but is stimulation meditation? Dependence on the group creates conformity; congregational worship or prayer is susceptible to suggestion, to influence, to thoughtlessness.

To meditate in isolation can also create hindrances and strengthen one's prejudices and conformities. If there is no pliability, eager awareness, mere living alone strengthens one's tendencies and idiosyncrasies, hardens the habits and deepens the

grooves of thought-feeling. Without understanding the significance of meditation, meditating alone can become a self-enclosing process, the narrowing of mind-heart in self-delusion and the strengthening of

So whether you meditate with a group or by yourself will have little meaning if the significance of meditation is not rightly understood. Meditation is not concentration, it is the creative process of self-discovery and understanding; meditation is not a process of self-becoming; beginning with self-knowledge it brings tranquillity and supreme wisdom, it opens the door to the Eternal. The purpose of meditation is to be aware of the total process of the self. The self is the result of the past and does not exist in isolation; it is made up. The many causes that have brought it into being must be understood and transcended; only through deep awareness and meditation can there be liberation from craving, from self. Then only is there true aloneness. But when you meditate by yourself you are not alone for you are the result of innumerable influences, of conflicting forces. You are a result, a product, and that which is made up, selected, put together, cannot understand that which is not. When the thinker and his thought are one, having gone above and beyond all formulation, there is that tranquillity in which alone is the Real. To meditate is to penetrate the many conditioned, educated layers of consciousness.

Since we are self-enclosed, in conflict and pain, it is essential to be keenly aware for through self-knowledge thought-feeling frees itself from its own self-created impediments of ill will and ignorance, worldliness and craving. It is this meditative understanding that is creative; this understanding brings about not

withdrawal, not exclusion, but spontaneous solitude.

The more we are meditatively aware during the so-called waking hours the less there are dreams, and less is the anxious fear of their interpretation; for if there is self-awareness during waking hours the different layers of consciousness are being uncovered and understood and in sleep there is the continuation of awareness. Meditation is not for a set period only but is to be continued during the waking hours and hours of sleep as well. In sleep, because of right meditative awareness during waking hours, thought can penetrate depths that have great significance. Even in sleep meditation continues.

Meditation is not a practice; it is not the cultivation of habit; meditation is heightened awareness. Mere practice dulls the mind. Habit denotes thoughtlessness and causes insensitivity. Right meditation is a liberative process, a creative self-discovery which frees thought-feeling from bondage. In freedom alone is there the Real. Questioner: In discussing the problem of illness you introduced the concept of psychological tension. If I remember correctly you stated that the non-use or abuse of psychological tension is the cause of illness. Modern psychology on the other hand mostly stresses relaxation, release from nervous tension and so forth. What do you think?

Krishnamurti: Must we not be strenuous if we would understand? As you are listening to this talk is there not attention, a tension? Is not all awareness an intensity of right tension? Awareness is necessary for comprehension; a strenuous attention is needed if we would grasp the full significance of a problem. Relaxation is necessary, sometimes beneficial; but is not

awareness, right tension, necessary for deep understanding? Must not the strings of a violin be tuned or stretched to produce the right tone? If they are stretched too much they break and if they are not stretched or tuned just rightly they do not give the correct tone. Likewise we break down when our nerves are strained too much; tension beyond endurance causes various forms of mental and physical disorders.

But is not awareness, the widening and stretching of the mind-heart, necessary for understanding? Is understanding the result of relaxation, inattention, or does it come with awareness in which there is not that tension caused by the desire to grasp, to gain? Is not alert stillness necessary for deep understanding?

Tension can either mend or mar. In all relationship is there not tension? This tension becomes harmful when relationship becomes an escape from one's own insufficiency, a self-protective shelter from painful self-discovery. Tension becomes harmful when relationship hardens and is no longer a self-revealing process. Most of us use relationship for self-gratification, self-aggrandizement, but when it fails us a harmful tension is created which leads to frustration, jealousy, delusion and conflict. As long as the craving of the self continues there will be the harmful psychological tension of inner insufficiency that causes varieties of delusion and misery. But to understand emptiness, aching loneliness, there must be right awareness, right tension. The tension of greed, fear, ambition, hate, is destructive, is productive of psychological and physical ailments, and to transcend that tension there must be choiceless awareness.

Craving which expresses itself in many ways, in the material

and so-called spiritual world, is the cause of conflict in all the different layers of consciousness. The tension of becoming is endless conflict and pain. In being aware of craving and so understanding it thought liberates itself from ignorance and sorrow.

## OJAI 10TH PUBLIC TALK 1945

Is there an enduring state of creative tranquillity? Is there an end to the seemingly endless struggle of the opposites? Is there an imperishable ecstasy?

The end to conflict and sorrow is through understanding and transcending the ways of the self and in discovering that imperishable Reality which is not the creation of the mind. Self-knowledge is arduous but without it ignorance and pain continue; without self-knowledge there can be no end to strife.

The world is splintered into many fragments, each in contention with the other; it is torn apart by antagonism, greed and passion; it is broken up by warring ideologies, beliefs and fears; neither organized religion nor politics can bring peace to man. Man is against man and the many explanations of his sorrow do not take away his pain. We have tried to escape from ourselves in many cunning ways but escape only dulls and hardens the mind and heart. The outer world is but an expression of our own inner state; as we are inwardly broken up and torn by burning desires, so is the world about us; as there is incessant turmoil within us so is there endless conflict in the world; as there is no inward tranquillity the world has become a battlefield. What we are the world is.

Is there a possibility of finding enduring joy? There is, but to experience it there must be freedom. Without freedom truth cannot be discovered, without freedom there can be no experience of the Real. Freedom must be sought out; freedom from saviours, teachers, leaders; freedom from the self-enclosing walls of good and bad; freedom from authority and imitation; freedom from self,



the cause of conflict and pain.

Just as long as craving in its different forms is not understood there will be conflict and pain. Conflict is not to be ended through superficial restatement of values nor by change of teachers and leaders. The ultimate solution lies in freedom from craving; not in another but in yourself is the way. The incessant battle within us all which we call existence cannot be brought to an end save through understanding and so transcending craving.

The conflict of acquisitiveness appears in knowledge, in relationship, in possessions; acquisitiveness in any form creates inequality and brutality. This division and conflict between man and man is not to be abolished through mere reform of the outer effects and values. Equality in possessions is not the way out of our extended and enveloping misery and stupidity; no revolution can free man from this spirit of exclusiveness. You may dislodge him from possessions through legislation, through revolution, but he will cling to exclusive relationship or belief. This spirit of exclusiveness at different levels cannot be abolished through any outward reform or through compulsion or regimentation. Yet it is this spirit of exclusiveness that breeds inequality and contention. Does not acquisitiveness set man against man? Can equality and compassion be established through any means of the mind? Must not they be sought elsewhere; does not this separateness cease only in Love, in Truth?

The unity of man is to be found only in Love, in the illumination that Truth brings. This oneness of man is not to be established through mere economic and social readjustment. The world is ever occupied with this superficial adjustment; it is ever

trying to rearrange values within the pattern of acquisitiveness; it tries to establish security on the insecurity of craving and so brings disaster upon itself. We hope that outward revolution, outward change of values will transform man; they do affect him but acquisitiveness, finding gratification at other levels continues. This endless and purposeless movement of acquisitiveness cannot at any time bring peace to man, and only when he is free of it can there be creative being.

Acquisitiveness creates division of those ahead and those behind. You must be both pupil and Master in search of Truth; you must make the approach directly without the conflict of example and following. There must be persistent self-awareness, and the more earnest and strenuous you are the more thought will free itself from its own self-created bondages.

In the bliss of the Real the experiencer and the experience cease. A mind-heart that is burdened with the memory of yesterday cannot live in the eternal present. Mind-heart must die each day for eternal being.

Questioner: I feel that at least to me what you are saying is something new and very vitalizing but the old intrudes and distorts. It seems that the new is overpowered by the past. What is one to do?

Krishnamurti: Thought is the result of the past acting in the present; the past is constantly sweeping over the present. The present, the new, is ever being absorbed by the past, by the known. To live in the eternal present there must be death to the past, to memory; in this death there is timeless renewal.

The present extends into the past and into the future; without the

understanding of the present the door to the past is closed. The perception of the new is so fleeting; no sooner is it felt than the swift current of the past sweeps over it and the new ceases to be. To die to the many yesterdays, to renew each day is only possible if we are capable of being passively aware. In this passive awareness there is no gathering to oneself; in it there is intense stillness in which the new is ever unfolding, in which silence is ever extending with measure.

We try to use the new as a means of breaking down or strengthening the past and so corrupt the living present. The renewing present brings comprehension of the past. It is the new that gives understanding and in that light the past has a fresh, life-giving significance. When we listen to or experience something new our instinctive response is to compare it with the old, with a past experience, with a fading memory. This comparing gives strength to the past, distorting the present and so the new is ever becoming the past, the dead. If thought-feeling were capable of living in the now without distorting it then the past would be transformed into the eternal present.

To some of you these talks and discussions may have brought a new and vitalizing understanding; what is important is not to put the new into old patterns of thought or phrase. Let it remain new, uncontaminated. If it is true it will cast out the old, the past by its, very abundant and creative light. The desire to make the creative present enduring, practical or useful makes it worthless. Let the new live without anchorage in the past, without the distorting influence of fears and hopes.

Die to your experience, to your memory. Die to your prejudice,

pleasant or unpleasant. As you die there is the incorruptible; this is not a state of nothingness but of creative being. It is this renewal that will, if allowed, dissolve our problems and sorrows however intricate and painful. Only in death of the self is there life.

Questioner: Do you believe in karma?

Krishnamurti: The desire to believe should be understood and put away for it does not bring enlightenment. He who is seeking Truth does not believe; he who is approaching Truth has no dogma or creed; he who is seeking the Timeless must be free of formulation and the time-binding quality of memory. When we believe we do not seek and belief brings doubt and pain. Search to understand, not to know; for in understanding, the dual process of the knower and the known ceases. In the mere search for knowledge the knower is ever becoming and so is ever in conflict and sorrow. He who asserts he knows does not know.

The root of the Sanskrit word karma means to act to do Action is the result of a cause. War is the result of our everyday life of stupidity and ill will and greed; conflict and sorrow are the outcome of the inward turmoil of our craving. Is not our existence the product of enchaining conditioning? Cause is ever undergoing a modification and alert awareness is necessary to follow and understand it. Silent and choiceless awareness not only reveals the cause but also frees thought-feeling from it. Can effect be separated from cause? Is not effect ever present in the cause? We desire to reform, to rearrange the effects without radically altering the cause. This occupation with effect is a form of escape from the basic cause.

As the end is in the means, so the effect is in the cause. It is

comparatively easy to discover the superficial cause but to discover and transcend craving, which is the deep cause of all conditioning, is arduous and demands constant awareness.

Questioner: Not only is there the fear of life but great is the fear of death. How am I to conquer it?

Krishnamurti: What is conquerable has to be conquered again and again. Fear comes to an end only through understanding. Fear of death is in the craving for self-fulfilment; we are empty and we crave completeness, so there is fear; we desire to achieve and so we are afraid lest death should call us. We desire time for understanding, the fulfillment of ambition needs time, and so we are afraid of death. We are in the bondage of time; death is the unknown and of the unknown we are afraid. Fear and death are the companions of life. We crave the assurance of self-continuity. Thought-feeling is moving from the known to the known and is always afraid of the unknown. Thought-feeling proceeds from accumulation to accumulation, from memory to memory, and the fear of death is the fear of frustration.

Because we are as the dead we fear death; the living do not. The dead are burdened by the past, by memory, by time, but for the living the present is the eternal. Time is not a means to the end, the Timeless, for the end is in the beginning. The self weaves the net of time and thought is caught in it. The insufficiency of the self, its aching emptiness, causes the fear of death and of life. This fear is with us always: in our activities, our pleasures and pain. Being dead we seek life but life is not found through the continuity of the self. The self, the maker of time, must yield itself to the Timeless.

If death is truly a great problem for you, not merely a verbal or

emotional issue nor a matter of curiosity which can be appeased by explanations, then in you there is deep silence. In active stillness fear ceases; silence has its own creative quickening. You do not transcend fear through rationalization, through the study of explanations; the fear of death does not come to an end through some belief for belief is still within the net of the self. The very noise of the self prevents its own dissolution. We consult, analyze, pray, exchange explanations; this incessant activity and noise of the self hinders the bliss of the Real. Noise can produce only more noise and in it there is no understanding.

Understanding comes when your whole being is deeply and silently aware. Silent awareness is not to be compelled or induced; in this tranquillity death yields to creation. Questioner: It has never occurred to me myself as being able to attain liberation. The ultimate I can conceive of is that perhaps I might be able to hold and strengthen that entirely incomprehensible relation to God which is the only thing I live by. and I really do not even know what that is.

You talk about being and becoming. I realize that these words mean fundamentally different attitudes and mine has been definitely one of becoming. I now want to transform what has been becoming all along into being. Am I fooling myself? I do not want simply to change words.

Krishnamurti: We must first understand the process of becoming and all its implications before we can comprehend what is being. Is not the structure of our thought-feeling based on time? Do we not think-feel in terms of gain and loss, of becoming and not becoming? We think Reality or God is to be reached through

time, through becoming. We think that life is an endless ladder for us to climb ever to greater and greater insights. Our thinking-feeling is caught in the horizontal process of becoming; the becomer is ever accumulating, ever gaining, ever expanding. The self, the becomer, the creator of time, can never experience the Timeless. The self, the becomer, is the cause of conflict and sorrow.

Does becoming lead to being? Through time can there be the Timeless? Through conflict can there be tranquillity? Through war, hate, can there be love? Only when becoming ceases is there being; through the horizontal process of time the Eternal is not; conflict does not lead to tranquillity; hate cannot be changed to love. The becomer can never be tranquil. Craving can never lead to that which is beyond and above all craving. The chain of sorrow is broken only when the becomer ceases to become, positively or negative

Now the becomer desires to translate his becoming into being. He sees perhaps the futility of becoming and desires to transform that process into being; instead of becoming, now he must be. He sees the pain of greed and now he desires to transform greed into non-greed which is still a becoming; he has assumed a new attitude, a new garb called non-greed; but still the becomer continues to become. Does not this desire to translate the becoming into being lead to illusion? The becomer perhaps now perceives the endless conflict and sorrow involved in becoming and so craves a different state which he calls being; but craving continues under a new name. The ways of becoming are very subtle and till the becomer is aware of them he will continue to become, to be in

conflict and sorrow. By changing terms we think we understand and how easily we pacify ourselves !

Being is only when there is no effort, positive or negative, to become; only when the becomer is self-aware and understands the enchainning sorrow and wasted effort of becoming and no longer uses will, then only can he be silent. His desire and his will have subsided; then only is there the tranquillity of supreme wisdom. To become non-greedy is one thing and being without greed is another; to become implies a process but being does not. Process implies time; the state of being is not a result, not a product of education, discipline, conditioning. You cannot transform noise into silence; silence can only come into being when noise ceases. Result is a time process, a determined end through a determined means; but through a process, through time, the Timeless is not. Self-awareness and right meditation will reveal the process of becoming. Meditation is not the cultivation of the becomer but through self-knowledge the meditator, the becomer ceases.

Questioner: If we only consider the obvious meaning of your words, memory constitutes one of the mechanisms against which you have warned time and again. And yet you yourself, for instance, sometimes use written notes to aid your memory in reconstructing the introductory remarks which you obviously have thought out previously. Does there exist one necessary and even indispensable kind of memory related to the outside world of facts and figures, and an entirely different kind of memory which might be called psychological memory, which is detrimental because it interferes with the creative attitude which you have hinted at in expressions like "lying fallow" - "dying each day" etc?



Krishnamurti: Memory is accumulated experience and what is accumulated is the known and what is known is ever the past. With the burden of the known can that which is Timeless be discovered? Is not freedom from the past necessary to experience that which is Immeasurable? That which is made up, that is, memory, cannot comprehend that which is not. Wisdom is not accumulated memory but is supreme vulnerability to the Real.

Should we not, as the questioner points out, be aware of the two kinds of memories: the indispensable, relating to facts and figures, and the psychological memory? Without this indispensable memory we could not communicate with each other. We accumulate and cling to psychological memories and so give continuity to the self; thus the self, the past, is ever increasing, ever adding to itself. It is this accumulating memory, the self, that must come to an end; as long as thought-feeling is identifying itself with the memories of yesterday it will be ever in conflict and sorrow; as long as thought-feeling is ever becoming it cannot experience the bliss of the Real. That which is Real is not the continuation of identifying memory. According to what has been stored up one experiences; according to one's conditioning and psychological memories and tendencies are the experiences, but such experiences are ever enclosing, limiting. It is to this accumulation that one must die.

Is the experience of the Real based on memory, on accumulation? Is it not possible for thought-feeling to go above and beyond these interrelated layers of memory? Continuance is memory and is it possible for this memory to cease and a new state come into being? Can the educated and conditioned consciousness

comprehend that which is not a result? It cannot and so it must die to itself. Psychological memory, ever striving to become, is creating results, barriers, and so is ever enslaving itself. It is to this becoming that thought-feeling must die; only through constant self-awareness does this self-identifying memory come to an end; it cannot come to an end through an act of will for will is craving and craving is the accumulation of identifying memory.

Truth is not to be formulated nor can it be discovered through any formulation or any belief; only when there is freedom from becoming, from self-identifying memory, does it come into being. Our thought is the result of the past and without understanding its conditioning it cannot go beyond itself. Thought-feeling become a slave to its own creation, to its own power of illusion if it is unaware of its own ways. Only when thought ceases to formulate can there be creation.

Questioner: Do not the images of saints, Masters, help us to meditate rightly?

Krishnamurti: If you would go north why look towards the south? If you would be free why become slaves? Must you know sobriety through drunkenness? Must you have tyranny to know freedom?

As meditation is of the highest importance we ought to approach it rightly from the very beginning. Right means create right ends; the end is in the means. Wrong means produce wrong ends and at no time will wrong means bring about right ends. By killing another will you bring about tolerance and compassion? Only right meditation can bring about right understanding. It is essential for the meditator to understand himself, not the objects of

his meditation, for the meditator and his meditation are one, not separate. Without understanding oneself meditation becomes a process of self-hypnosis inducing experiences according to one's conditioning, one's belief. The dreamer must understand himself, not his dreams; he must awaken and put an end to them. If the meditator is seeking an end, a result, then he will hypnotize himself by his desire. Meditation is often a self-hypnotic process; it may produce certain desired results but such meditation does not bring enlightenment.

The questioner wants to know if examples help one to meditate rightly. They may help to concentrate, to focus attention, but such concentration is not meditation. Mere concentration though troublesome is comparatively easy, but what then? The concentrator is still what he is, only he has acquired a new faculty, a new means through which he can function, enjoy and do harm. Of what value is concentration if he who concentrates is lustful, worldly and stupid? He will still do harm; he will still create enmity and confusion. Mere concentration narrows the mind-heart which only strengthens its conditioning, thus causing credulity and obstinacy. Before you learn to concentrate, understand the structure of your whole being, not just one part of it. With self-awareness there comes self-knowledge, right thinking. This self-awareness or understanding creates its own discipline and concentration; such pliable discipline is enduring, effective, not the self-imposed discipline of greed and envy. Understanding ever widens and deepens into extensional awareness; this awareness is essential for right meditation. Meditation of the heart is understanding.

We use examples as a means of inspiration. Why do we seek

inspiration? As our lives are empty, dull and mechanical we seek inspiration outside of ourselves. The Master, the saint, the saviour then becomes a necessity, a necessity which enslaves us. Being enslaved you then have to free yourself from your enchainment to discover the Real, for the Real can only be experienced in freedom.

Because you are not interested in self-knowledge you seek from others inspiration which is another form of distraction. Self-knowledge is a process of creative discovery which is hindered when thought-feeling is concerned with gain. Greed for a result prevents the flowering of self-knowledge. Search itself is devotion, it is in itself inspiration. A mind that is identifying, comparing, judging, soon wearies and needs distraction, so-called inspiration. All distraction, noble or otherwise, is idolatrous.

But if the meditator begins to understand himself then his meditation has great significance. Through self-awareness and self-knowledge there comes right thinking; only then can thought go above and beyond the conditioned layers of consciousness. Meditation then is being, which has its own eternal movement; it is creation itself for the meditator has ceased to be.

## OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 1946

Though this is not a small group we will try to have a free and serious discussion instead of turning these gatherings into question and answer meetings. Some no doubt would prefer uninterrupted talks but it seems to me to be more advantageous for all of us to join in a purposeful discussion which requires earnestness and sustained interest.

For what are we striving? What is it that each one is seeking? Till we are aware of our separate pursuits it is not possible to establish right relationship between us. One might be seeking fulfillment and success, another wealth and power, another fame and popularity; some may wish to accumulate and some to renounce; there might be some who are earnestly seeking to dissolve the ego while others may wish merely to talk about it. Is it not important for us to find out what it is we are seeking? To extricate ourselves from the confusion and misery in and about us we must be aware of our instinctive and cultivated desires and tendencies. We think and feel in terms of achievement, of gain and loss, and so there is constant strife; but there is a way of living, a state of being, in which conflict and sorrow have no place.

So to make these discussions fruitful it is necessary, is it not, first to understand our own intentions? When we observe what is taking place in our lives and in the world we perceive that most of us, in subtle or crude ways, are occupied with the expansion of the self. We crave self-expansion now or in the future; for us life is a process of the continuous expansion of the ego through power, wealth, asceticism or the cultivation of virtue and so on. Not only

for the individual but for the group, for the nation this process signifies fulfilling, becoming, growing and has ever led to great disasters and miseries. We are ever striving within the framework of the self, however much it may be enlarged and glorified. If this be your aim and mine wholly different then we will have no relationship though we may meet; then our discussions will be purposeless and confused. So first we must be very clear in our intention. We must be clear and definite as to what we are seeking. Are we craving self-expansion, the constant nourishment of the ego, the me and the mine, or are we seeking to understand and so transcend the process of the self? Will self-expansion bring about understanding, enlightenment; or is there illumination, liberation only when the process of self-expansion has ceased? Can we reveal ourselves sufficiently to discern in which direction our interest lies? You must have come here with serious intent; therefore we will discuss in order to clarify that intent, and consider if our daily life indicates what our pursuits are and whether we are nourishing the ego or not. So these discussions can be a means of self-exposure to each one of us. In this self-exposure we will discover the true significance of life.

Must we not first have freedom to discover? There can be no freedom if our action is ever enclosing. Is not the action of the ego, the sense of the me and the mine, ever a process of limitation? We are trying to find out, are we not, if the process of self-expansion leads to Reality or if Reality comes into being only when the self ceases?

Questioner: Must one not go through the self-expansive process in order to realize the Immeasurable?

Krishnamurti: May I put the same question differently? Must one go through drunkenness to know sobriety? Must one go through the various states of craving only to renounce them?

Questioner: Can one do anything with regard to this self-expansive process?

Krishnamurti: May I elaborate this question? We are, are we not, positively encouraging through many actions the expansion of the ego? Our tradition, our education, our social conditioning sustain positively the activities of the ego. This positive activity may take a negative form - not to be something. So our action is still a positive or negative activity of the self. Through centuries of tradition and education thought accepts as natural and inevitable the self-expansive life, positively or negatively. How can thought free itself from this conditioning? How can it be tranquil, silent? If there is that stillness, that is, if it is not caught in self-expansive processes, then there is Reality.

Questioner: If I rightly understand, surely you are reaching way out into the abstract, are you not? You are speaking about reincarnation, I presume?

Krishnamurti: I am not, sir, nor am I reaching out into the abstract. Our social and religious structure is based on the urge to become something, positively or negatively. Such a process is the very nourishment of the ego, through name, family, achievement, through identification of the me and mine which is ever causing conflict and sorrow. We perceive the results of this way of life: strife, confusion and antagonism, ever spreading, ever engulfing. How is one to transcend strife and sorrow? This is what we are attempting to understand during these discussions.

Is not craving the very root of the self? How is thought which has become the means of self-expansion to act without giving sustenance to the ego, the cause of conflict and sorrow? Is this not an important question? Do not let me make it important to you. Is this not a vital question to each one? If it is, must we not find the true answer? We are nourishing the ego in many ways and before we condemn or encourage we must understand its significance, must we not? We use religion and philosophy as a means of self-expansion; our social structure is based on the aggrandizement of the self; the clerk will become the manager and later the owner, the pupil will become the Master and so on. In this process there is ever conflict, antagonism, sorrow. Is this an intelligent and inevitable process? We can discover Truth for ourselves only when we do not depend on another; no specialist can give us the right answer. Each one has to find the right answer directly for himself. For this reason it is important to be earnest.

We vary in our earnestness according to circumstances, our moods and fancies. Earnestness must be independent of circumstances and moods, of persuasion and hope. We often think that perhaps through shock we shall be made earnest but dependence is never productive of earnestness. Earnestness comes into being with inquiring awareness and are we so alertly aware? If you are aware you will realize that your mind is constantly engaged in the activities of the ego and its identification; if you pursue this activity further you will find the deep seated self-interest. These thoughts of self-interest arise from the needs of daily life, things you do from moment to moment, your role in society and so on, all of which build up the structure of the ego.



This seems so strangely inevitable but before we accept this inevitability must we not be aware of our purposive intention, whether we desire to nourish the ego or not? For according to our hidden intentions we will act. We know how the self is built up and strengthened through the pleasure and pain principle, through memory, through identification and so on. This process is the cause of conflict and sorrow. Do we earnestly seek to put an end to the cause of sorrow?

Questioner: How do we know our intention is right before we understand the truth of the matter? If we do not first comprehend truth then we shall go off the beam, founding communities, forming groups, having half baked ideas. Is it not necessary, as you have suggested, to know oneself first? I have tried to write down my thoughts-feelings as has been suggested but I find myself blocked and unable to follow my thoughts right through.

Krishnamurti: Through being choicelessly aware of your intentions the truth of the matter is known. We are often blocked because unconsciously we are afraid to take action which might lead to further trouble and suffering. But no clear and definite action can take place if we have not uncovered our deep and hidden intention with regard to nourishing and maintaining the self. Is not this fear which hinders understanding the result of projection, speculation? You imagine that freedom from self-expansion is a state of nothingness, an emptiness and this creates fear, thus preventing any actual experience. Through speculation, through imagination you prevent the discovery of what is. As the self is in constant flux we seek, through identification, permanency. Identification brings about the illusion of permanency

and it is the loss of this which causes fear. We recognize that the self is in constant flux yet we cling to something which we call the permanent in the self, an enduring self which we fabricate out of the impermanent self. If we deeply experienced and understood that the self is ever impermanent then there would be no identification with any particular form of craving, with any particular country, nation or with any organized system of thought or religion, for with identification comes the horror of war, the ruthlessness of so-called civilization.

Questioner: Is the fact of this constant flux not enough to make us identify? It seems to me that we cling to something called the me, the self, for it is a pleasant habit of sound. We know a river even when it is dry; similarly we cling to something that is me, even though we know its impermanency. The me is shallow or deep, in full flood or dry, but it is always the me to be encouraged, nourished, maintained at any cost. Why must the I process be eliminated?

Krishnamurti: Now why do you ask this question? If the process is pleasurable you will continue in it and not ask such a question; when it is disagreeable, painful, then only will you desire to put an end to it. According to pleasure and pain thought is shaped, controlled, guided and upon such a weak, changing foundation we make an attempt to understand Truth! Whether the self should be maintained or not is a very vital issue for on it depends the whole course of our action, and so how we approach this problem is all important. On our approach depends the answer. If we are not earnest then the answer will be according to our prejudices and passing fancies. So the approach matters more than the problem

itself. Upon the seeker depends what he finds; if he is prejudiced, limited, then he will find according to his conditioning. What then is important is for the seeker first to understand himself.

Questioner: How do we know if there is an abstract truth?

Krishnamurti: Surely, sir, we are not considering now an abstract truth. We are attempting to discover the true and lasting answer to our problem of sorrow, for on that depends the whole course of life. Questioner: Can the conditioned mind observe its conditioning?

Krishnamurti: Is it not possible to be aware of our prejudices? Cannot we know when we are dishonest, when we are intolerant, when we are greedy?

Questioner: Is not the nourishment of the body equally wrong?

Krishnamurti: We are considering the psychological nourishment, the expansion of the self, which causes such strife and misery. One can accept the activity of the self as inevitable and follow that course or there may be another way of life. If it is an intense problem to each one of us then we shall find the right answer.

Questioner: Shall we not know the true answer when the desire for it is greater than for any other thing?

Questioner: Is the ego always harmful? Is selfishness ever beneficial?

Krishnamurti: Self-centred attention and activity, positively or negatively, is the cause of strife and pain. How seriously is each one considering this problem? How earnest are we about discovering the truth of the nature and activity of the ego, the self? Our meditation and spiritual discipline have no meaning if first we

are not clear upon this point. True meditation is not self-expansion in any form. So till we can have a common understanding of our purpose there will be confusion, and right relationship between us will not be possible.

Questioner: Is there not a way straight to the problem, to find out the truth?

Krishnamurti: There is, but this demands utter stillness, open receptivity. This requires right understanding; otherwise effort to be open, to be tranquil becomes another means of self-expansion. I am saying that there is a different way of life, a way that is not of self-expansion, in which there is ecstasy, but it has no validity if you merely accept my statement; such acceptance will become another form of egotistic activity. You must know for yourself, directly, the truth of yourself and you cannot realize it through another, however great. There is no authority that can reveal it. Truth can be uncovered only through your own understanding and understanding comes only through self-knowledge. We have a common problem to which we are trying to find the right answer.

Questioner: Writing a book could be a self-expansive action, could it not?

Questioner: Should we not establish a purpose in our lives?

Krishnamurti: The ego can choose a noble purpose and so utilize it as a means for its own expansion.

Questioner: If there is no self-expansion is there a purpose, as we know it now?

Krishnamurti: A man who is asleep dreams that he has a purpose or must choose a purpose but does he who is awake have a purpose? He is simply awake. Our frames of reference, our

purposes are a means, negatively or positively, of measuring the growth of the self.

Questioner: Is fulfillment self-expansion?

Krishnamurti: If fulfillment is prevented is there not the pain of frustration of the self? Questions of similar kind will find their answer in discovering the truth concerning the self-expansive process; this depends on earnestness and on the open receptivity of the mind-heart.

Questioner: Must we not know what is the other way of life before we can relinquish self-aggrandizement?

Krishnamurti: How can we know or be aware of another way of life till we can perceive the falseness, the futility of acquisition and self-expansion? In understanding the ways of self-aggrandizement we shall become aware. To speculate about the way becomes a hindrance to the very understanding of that life which is not one of self-perpetuation. So must we not discover the truth concerning the habitual activities of the self? It is knowledge of the hindrance that is the liberating factor, not the attempt to be free from the hindrance. Effort made to be free without the liberating action of Truth is still within the enclosing walls of the self. You can discover Truth only if you are willing to give your whole mind and heart to it, not a few moments of your easily spared time. If we are earnest we will find Truth; but this earnestness cannot depend on stimulation of any kind. We must give our full and deep attention to the discovery of the truth of our problem, not for a few grudging moments but constantly. It is Truth alone that liberates thought from its own enclosing process.

## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 1946

We have been saying there can be no right relationship between us if we do not understand each other's intentions. The way of self-expansion is the way of strife and sorrow and is not the way of Reality. The ecstasy of Reality is to be found through awakened, highest intelligence. Intelligence is not the cultivation of memory or reason but an awareness in which identification and choice have ceased.

To think out a thought fully is difficult for it needs patience and extensional awareness. We have been educated in a way of life which furthers the self, through achievement, through identification, through organized religion; this way of thought and action has led us to fearful catastrophes and untold misery.

Questioner: You have said that illumination could never come through self-expansion but does it not come through the expansion of consciousness?

Krishnamurti: Illumination, understanding of the Real, can never come through the expansion of the self, through the I making an effort to grow, to become, to achieve and there is no effort apart from the will of the I. How can there be understanding if the self is ever filtering experience, identifying, accumulating memory? Consciousness is the product of the mind and the mind is the result of conditioning, of craving, and so it is the seat of the self. Only when the activity of the self, of memory, ceases is there a wholly different consciousness, about which any speculation is a hindrance. The effort to expand is still the activity of the self whose consciousness is to grow, to become. Such consciousness

however expanded is time-binding and so the Timeless is not.

If one desires to understand a vital problem should not one put aside one's tendencies, prejudices, fears and hopes, one's conditioning, and be aware simply and directly? In thinking over our problems together we are exposing ourselves to ourselves. This self-exposure is of great importance for it will reveal to us the process of our own thoughts-feelings. We have to dig deeply into ourselves to find truth. We are conditioned and is it possible for thought to go beyond its own limitation? It is possible only through being aware of our conditioning. We have developed a certain kind of intelligence in the process of self-expansion; through greed, through acquisitiveness, through conflict and pain we have developed a self-protective, self-expansive intelligence. Can this intelligence comprehend the Real which alone can resolve all our problems? Questioner: Is intelligence the right word to use?

Krishnamurti: If we all understand the meaning of that term as I am using it here, it is applicable. The main point is, can this intelligence which has been cultivated through the expansion of the self experience or discover truth; or must there be another kind of activity, another kind of awareness to receive truth? To discover truth there must be freedom from the self-expansive intelligence for it is ever enclosing, ever limiting.

Questioner: Must we not look at this problem of self-expansion from the point of view of what is true?

Krishnamurti: To see the false as the false and the true as the true is difficult. If you saw the truth about self-expansion problems would begin to fade away. To see the truth in the false is to understand yourself first. It is the truth in the false that is liberating.

Questioner: Do you imply that there is a greater intelligence than ours?

Krishnamurti: We are not trying to discover whether there is a greater intelligence but what we are considering is whether the particular intelligence we have so sedulously cultivated can experience or understand Reality.

Questioner: Is there a Reality?

Krishnamurti: To discover that, there must be a tranquil mind, a mind that is not fabricating thoughts, images, hopes. As the mind is ever seeking to expand through its own creations it cannot experience Reality. If the mind, the instrument, is blurred, it is of little use in the search of truth. It must first cleanse itself and then only will it be possible to know if there is Reality. So each one must be aware, recognize the state of his intelligence. By its very limitation is not the mind a hindrance to the discovery of the Real? Before thought can free itself it first must recognize its own limitations.

Questioner: Can you tell us how to go through this process without impairing ourselves?

Krishnamurti: I am afraid we are talking at cross purposes and so we are getting confused. What is it that each one of us is seeking? Are we not aware of a common search?

Questioner: I am trying to solve my problem. I am seeking God. I want love. I want security. Krishnamurti: Are we not all seeking to transcend conflict and sorrow? Conflict and sorrow come to us in different ways but the cause common to us all is self-expansion. The cause of conflict and sorrow is craving, the self. Through understanding and so dissolving the cause our psychological



problems will come to an end.

Questioner: Will the solution of the central problem end for me all problems?

Krishnamurti: Only if you dissolve the cause of all problems, the self; till then each day brings new strife and pain.

Questioner: My intelligence says that by solving my individual problem I can fit harmoniously into the whole. Are there different purposes for each one of us?

Krishnamurti: Out of our self-contradiction and confusion have we not invented purposes according to our tendencies and desires? Are not our purposes and problems fabricated by the self?

Being in sorrow we seek to be happy. If this is our chief concern, as it surely is for most of us, then we must know what the causes are that prevent us from being happy, or that make us sorrowful.

Questioner: How am I to eradicate the causes?

Krishnamurti: Before you put that question you must be aware of the causes of sorrow. Being in sorrow you say you are seeking happiness; so the search for happiness is an escape from sorrow. There can be happiness only when the cause of sorrow ceases; so happiness is a byproduct and not an end in itself. The cause of sorrow is the self with its craving to expand, to become, to be other than what it is; with its craving for sensation, for power, for happiness and so on.

Questioner: If there were no discontent there would be no progress, there would be stagnation.

Krishnamurti: You want both "progress" and happiness and that is your difficulty, is it not? You desire self-expansion but not the

conflict and sorrow that inevitably come with it. We are afraid to look at ourselves as we are, we want to run away from the actual and this flight we call "progress" or the search for happiness. We say that we will decay if we do not "progress; we will become lazy, thoughtless, if we do not struggle to run away from what is. Our education and the world that we have created help us to run away; yet to be happy we must know the cause of sorrow. To know the cause of sorrow and transcend it is to face it, not to seek escape through illusory ideals or through further activities of the self. The cause of sorrow is the activity of the expanding self. Even to crave to be rid of the self is negative action of the self and hence delusive.

Questioner: Could we take a positive rather than a negative point of view, saying to ourselves that we are the whole?

Krishnamurti: Is not a positive or negative action of the self still the movement of the self? If the self asserts that it is the whole is not that an activity of the self seeking to enclose the whole within its own walls? We think that by constantly asserting we are the whole, we will become the whole; such repetition is self-hypnosis and to be drugged is not to be illumined. We are not yet aware of the cunning deceptions of our minds, of the subtle ways of the self. Without self-knowledge there can be no happiness, no wisdom.

Questioner: I do not desire self-expansion.

Krishnamurti: Can it be so easily thought and said? The desire for self-expansion is complex and subtle. The structure of our thought is based on this expansion, to grow, to become, to fulfil.

Questioner: The cause of sorrow is incompleteness. Expansion stimulates and so we crave for it.

Krishnamurti: Can we not experience here and now directly for ourselves the cause of sorrow? If we can experience and understand this urge to expand, to be, then we shall go beyond the verbal state to the root of sorrow.

Questioner: I want to find truth and that is one of my reasons for self-expansion.

Krishnamurti: Why are you seeking truth? Do you seek it because you are unhappy and so through its discovery you hope to be happy? Truth is not compensation; it is not a reward for your suffering, for your struggles. Do you hope that it will set you free? The activity of the self is ever binding and does not lead to truth. Without self-awareness and self-knowledge how can there be the understanding of truth? We think we are seeking truth; but perhaps we are only seeking gratifying remedies, comforting answers. We verbally assert the need for brotherhood, for unity, without eradicating in ourselves the causes of conflict and antagonism. We must be aware of the cause of self-expansion and directly experience its full implications.

Questioner: Self-expansion is a natural instinct and what is wrong with it? Questioner: We want to be loved and if we are frustrated we seek another form of gratification. We are continually seeking satisfaction.

Krishnamurti: The seemingly natural instinct for self-expansion is the cause of discontent and pain; it is the cause of our recurrent disasters, civilized ruthlessness and mounting misery. It may be "natural" but surely it must be transcended for the Timeless to be. The craving for gratification is without end.

Questioner: Why is there the urge to be superior?

Questioner: I do not know why but there is in me the urge to be superior. I cannot observe it without being amused or appalled, yet I want to be superior. I know it is wrong to feel superior. It leads to misery, it is antisocial, it is immoral.

Krishnamurti: You are merely condemning the desire to be superior; you are not trying to understand it. To condemn or accept is to create resistance which hinders understanding. Do not all of us desire to be superior in some way or another? If we deny it, if we condemn it or are blind to it we shall not understand the causes that sustain this desire.

Questioner: I want to be superior because I want to be loved by people for it is necessary to be loved.

Krishnamurti: Being inferior there is the urge to feel superior; not being loved we desire to be loved. That is, in myself I am insignificant, empty, shallow, so I desire to put on masks for different occasions, the mask of superiority and of nobility, the mask of earnestness, the mask that asserts it is seeking God and so on. Being inwardly poor we desire to identify ourselves with the great, with the nation, with the Master, with an ideology and so on, the form of identification varying with circumstances and moods.

You may pursue virtue and practice spiritual exercises but by covering up this incompleteness. in denying it consciously or unconsciously, it is not transcended. Till it is transcended all activity is of the self which is the cause of conflict and sorrow. Being inwardly insufficient we have developed the cunning art of escape; this escape we call by various pleasant sounding names. How can this process of the mind comprehend the Real? How can it comprehend something not of its own fabrication?

The desire to be superior, to become the Master, to accumulate knowledge, to lose oneself in activities offers hopeful and gratifying escape from inward poverty, insufficiency. Being incomplete, empty, any activity, however noble, can only be the expansive movement of the self.

Questioner: Can we not occasionally realize that we are escaping?

Krishnamurti: We may, but our self-expansive urge is so cunning, subtle, that it avoids coming directly in conflict with this aching insufficiency. How to approach this problem is our difficulty, is it not?

Questioner: When you are free what is the purpose of activity?

Krishnamurti: How can mind that is the outcome of insufficiency and fear experience an activity which is not of the self? How can a mind that is acquisitive and fearful, bound by dogma and its limitation is only a postponement of the realization of its bondage. If I may suggest, can we try during the coming week to be aware of this bondage that has been developed by the process of self-expansion, for this limitation, this expanding self can never experience or discover the Real?

## OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 1946

Without the experience of the Real there can never be freedom from conflict and sorrow; the Real alone can transform our life, not mere resolution. All activity of the self with its resolutions and negations must cease for the Real to be. To understand the activities of the self there must be earnest endeavour, sustained alertness and interest. Many of us hold to our beliefs or to our experiences and this only breeds obstinacy. Earnestness is not dependent on moods, on circumstances nor on stimulation. Some who are attempting to live an earnest life are strenuous along some particular groove of thought, belief or discipline and thus become intolerant and rigid. Such strenuous effort prevents deep understanding and close the door upon Reality. If you will consider this closely you will see that what is necessary is natural effortless discernment, the freedom to discover and understand. These ideas, if allowed, will take root and bring about a radical transformation of our daily life. The unforced receptivity is much more significant than the effort made to understand.

Questioner: I am afraid it is not very clear.

Krishnamurti: Most of us here are making an effort to understand; such effort is the activity of will which only creates resistance and resistance is not overcome by another resistance, by another act of will; such effort actually prevents understanding; whereas if we were alertly pliable and aware we would understand deeply. All effort we now make issues from the desire for self-expansion; only when there is an effortless awareness can there be discovery and understanding, a perception of the true.

When we see a painting we first want to know who the painter is, we then compare and criticize it, or try to interpret it according to our conditioning. We do not really see the picture or the scenery but are only concerned with our clever capacity for interpretation, criticism or admiration; we are generally so full of ourselves that we do not really see the picture or the scenery. If we could banish our judgment and clever analysis then perhaps the picture might convey its significance. Similarly these discussions will have meaning only if we are open to the experience of discovery which is prevented by our clinging obstinately to beliefs, memories and conditioned prejudices.

Questioner: Is there anything that one can do to be passively aware? Can I do anything to be open?

Krishnamurti: The very desire to be open can be an effort of the self which only creates resistance. We can but be aware that we are enclosed, that the activity of will is resistance and that the very desire itself to gain passive awareness is another hindrance. To make a positive effort to be open is to throw up the barrier of greed. To be aware of the self-enclosing activities is to break them down; to be unaware and yet desire to be open is to create further resistance. Passive awareness comes only when the mind-heart is tranquil. In this stillness the Real comes into being. This stillness is not to be induced nor is it the outcome of the activity of will. An intelligence which is the product of desire, of self-expansion, is ever creating resistance and it can never bring about tranquillity. Such intelligence of self-protectiveness is the product of time, of the impermanent, and so can never experience the Timeless.

Questioner: Is not this intelligence useful in other ways?

Krishnamurti: Its only use is in protecting itself which has caused untold misery and pain. Questioner: From the amoeba to man the intelligence to be secure, to self-expand is inevitable and natural; it is a closed and vicious circle.

Krishnamurti: That may seem so but the activity to be secure has not led man to security, to happiness, to wisdom. It has led him to ever increasing confusion, conflict and misery. There is a different activity which is not of the self, which must be sought out. A different intelligence is needed to experience the Timeless, which alone will free us from incessant strife and sorrow. The intelligence that we now possess is the result of craving gratification, security, in crude or subtle form; it is the result of greed; it is the outcome of self-identification. Such an intelligence can never experience the Real.

Questioner: Do you say that intelligence and self-consciousness are synonymous?

Krishnamurti: Consciousness is the outcome of identified continuity. Sensation, feeling, rationalization and the continuity of identified memory make up self-consciousness, do they not? Can we say precisely where consciousness ends and intelligence begins? They flow into each other, do they not? Is there consciousness without intelligence?

Questioner: Does a new intelligence come into being if we are aware of the self-expansive intelligence?

Krishnamurti: We shall know, as experience, the new form of intelligence only when the self-protective and self-expansive intelligence ceases.

Questioner: How can we go beyond this limited intelligence?



Krishnamurti: Through being passively aware of its complex and interrelated activities. In so being aware the causes that nourish the intelligence of the self come to an end without self-conscious effort.

Questioner: How can one cultivate the other intelligence?

Krishnamurti: Is not that a wrong question? I wonder if we are paying interested attention to what is being said. The wrong cannot cultivate the right. We are still thinking in terms of self-expanding intelligence and that is our difficulty. We are unaware of it and so we ask, without thought, how can the other intelligence be cultivated? Surely there are certain obvious, essential requirements which will free the mind from this limited intelligence; humility which is related to humor and mercy; to be without greed which is to be without identification; to be unworldly which is to be free from sensate values; to be free from stupidity, from ignorance which is the lack of self-knowledge, and so on. We must be aware of the cunning and devious ways of the self, and in understanding them virtue comes into being, but virtue is not an end in itself. Self-interest cannot cultivate virtue, it can only perpetuate itself under the mask of virtue; under the cover of virtue there is still the activity of the self. It is as though we were attempting to see the clear, pure light through coloured glasses, which we are unaware of wearing. To see the pure light we must first be aware of our coloured glasses; this very awareness, if the urge to see the pure light is strong, helps to remove the coloured glasses. This removal is not the action of one resistance against another but is an effortless action of understanding. We must be aware of the actual and the understanding of what is will set thought free; this very

understanding will bring about open receptivity, transcending the particular intelligence.

Questioner: How does the intelligence with which we are all familiar come into being?

Krishnamurti: It comes into being through perception, sensation, contact, desire, identification, all of which give continuity to the self through memory. The principle of pleasure, pain, identification is ever sustaining this intelligence which can never open the door to Truth.

Questioner: We do have to make some kind of effort, do we not?

Krishnamurti: The effort that we now make is an activity of the expansion of the self with its particular intelligence. This effort can only strengthen, positively or negatively, the self-protective intelligence or resistance. This intelligence can never experience the Real which alone brings liberation from our conflict, confusion and sorrow.

Questioner: How has this intelligence come into being?

Krishnamurti: Has it not been cultivated through specialization? Has it not come into being through imitation, through conditioning? The cultivation of the me and the mine is specialization; the me that is special, all important: my work, my action, my success, my virtue, my country, my saviour; this positive and negative striving to become implies specialization. Specialization is death, the lack of infinite pliability. Questioner: I see that but what am I to do?

Krishnamurti: Be aware, without choice, of this process of specialization and you will discover that a deep revolutionary

change is taking place within you. Do not say to yourself that you are going to be aware, or that awareness has to be cultivated, or that it is a matter of growth or craftsmanship, which is an indication of postponement, laziness. You are or you are not aware. Be aware now of this specializing process.

Questioner: All this implies extensive self-study and self-knowledge, does it not?

Krishnamurti: And that is the very thing we are attempting here; we are exposing to ourselves the ways of our thought-feeling, its cunning, its subtlety, its pride in its so-called intelligence and so on. This is not book knowledge but actual experience, from moment to moment, in the ways of the self. Thus we are trying to uncover the ways of the self. The desire to expand in the world or to pursue virtue is still the activity of the self; the urge to become, negatively or positively, is the factor in specialization. This desire which prevents infinite pliability must be understood through awareness of the specializing process of the me.

Questioner: If I am just pliable can't I go wrong and therefore must I not be anchored in truth?

Krishnamurti: Truth is discovered in the uncharted sea of self-knowledge. But why do you ask this question? Is it not because you are frightened lest you go astray? Does it not imply that you crave to achieve, to succeed, to be ever in the right? We crave security and this craving prevents the freedom of Truth. Those who are deep in self-knowledge are pliable. We see that one of the causes of resistance is specialization; and another is imitation. The desire to copy is complex and subtle. The structure of our thought is based on imitation, religious or worldly. Newspapers, radios,

magazines, books, education, governments, organized religions, all these and other factors help to make thought conform. Also each one desires to conform; for it is easier to conform than to be aware. Conformity is the basis of our social existence and we are afraid to be alone. Fear and thoughtlessness bring about acceptance and conformity, the acceptance of authority. As with the individual so with the group, with the nation.

Conformity is one of the many means through which the self maintains itself. Thought moves from the known to the known, ever fearful of the unknown, of the uncertain, and yet only when there is uncertainty, when the mind is not in the bondage of the known is there the ecstasy of the Real. Thought must be alone for the comprehension of the Real. Through self-knowledge the imitative process comes to an end.

Questioner: Must we always face the unknown?

Krishnamurti: The Eternal is ever the unknown for a mind that accumulates; what is accumulated is memory and memory is ever the past, the time-binder. That which is the result of time cannot experience the Timeless, the Unknown.

We shall always be faced with the unknown till we understand the knowable, which is ourselves. This understanding cannot be given to you by the specialist, the psychologist or the priest; you must seek it for yourself, in yourself, through self-awareness. Memory, the past, is shaping the present according to the pattern of pleasure and pain. Memory becomes the guide, the path towards safety, security; it is this identifying memory that gives continuity to the self.

The search for self-knowledge demands constant alertness, an

awareness without choice which is difficult and arduous.

Questioner: Are we worms which must turn into butterflies?

Krishnamurti: Again how easily we slip into ignorant ways of thinking! Being evil we will eventually become good; being mortal we will become immortal. With these comforting thoughts we drug ourselves. Evil can never become good; hate can never become love; greed can never become non-greed. Hate must be abandoned, it cannot be changed into something which it is not. Through growth, through time evil cannot become good. Time does not make the ignoble noble. We must be aware of this ignorance and its illusions. We are educated to think that the conflict of the opposites produces a hoped for result, but this is not so. An opposite is the outcome of resistance and resistance is not overcome by opposition. Each resistance must be dissolved not by its opposite but through understanding the resistance itself.

Conflict exists between various desires, not between light and darkness. There can never be struggle between light and darkness for where there is light darkness is not, where there is truth the false is not. When the self divides itself into the higher and the lower, this very contradiction begets conflict, confusion and antagonism. To be aware of what is and not escape into fanciful illusion is the beginning of understanding. We should be concerned with what is, the craving for self-expansion, and not try to transform it, for the transformer is still craving which is the action of the self; the very awareness of what is brings about understanding. To be aware from moment to moment brings its own clarification. The desire for achievement and recognition prevents awakening; the sleeper dreams that he must awaken and

struggles in his dream but it is only a dream. The sleeper cannot awaken through dreams; he must cease sleeping. Thought itself must be aware of creating the structure of the self and its perpetuation. One who is earnest must discover for himself the truth about self-perpetuation.

Questioner: What is there to prove that the perpetuation of the self is in itself bad?

Krishnamurti: Nothing at all, if we are satisfied with it and unaware of the issues of life, but we are all in comparative strife and sorrow. Some cover up their pains or escape from them. They have not resolved their confusion and misery.

Realizing our state of self-contradiction and its painful conflicts we want to find the right way of transcending it; for in incompleteness there is no peace. Is it not the very nature of the self, at all times, to be contradictory? This contradiction breeds conflict confusion and enmity. Craving, the very basis of the self, is ever unfulfilled; in trying to overcome incompleteness man is ever in conflict within and without. Those who are in earnest must discover for themselves the truth about incompleteness. This discovery does not depend on any authority or formula nor on the acquisition of knowledge. To discover truth we must be passively aware. Since we are afraid and enclosed we must be aware of the causes that create resistance, of the desire for self-perpetuation which creates conflict.

Questioner: What happens to that self-perpetuating intelligence when a soldier in battle throws himself in front of a gun to save another?

Krishnamurti: Probably at the moment of great tension the

soldier forgets himself but is that a recommendation for war?

Questioner: Do we not hear that war brings out noble, self-sacrificing qualities?

Krishnamurti: Through a wrong act, the killing of another, can a right worthy end be realized?

Questioner: Is not self-knowledge a difficult pursuit?

Krishnamurti: It is and yet it is not. It demands effortless discernment, sensitive receptivity. Constant alertness is arduous because we are lazy; we would rather gain through others, through much reading, but information is not self-knowledge. In the meanwhile we continue with greed, wars and the vain repetition of rituals. All this indicates, does it not, the desire to run away from the real problem which is you and your inner insufficiency? Without understanding yourself mere outward activity, however worthy and satisfying, only leads to further confusion and conflict. The earnest search for truth through self-knowledge is truly religious. The truly religious individual begins with himself; his self-knowledge and understanding form the basis of all his activity. As he understands he will know what it is to serve and what it is to love.

## OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 1946

In the last three talks we have been considering that intelligence which is developed through the activities and habits of the self; that desire which is constantly accumulating and with which thought identifies itself as the me and the mine. This accumulative, identifying habit is called intelligence; the aggressive and self-expanding desire ever seeking security, certainty, is called intelligence. This enchaining habit-memory binds thought and so intelligence is imprisoned in the self. How can this intelligence, this mind that is petty, narrow, cruel, nationalistic, envious, comprehend the Real? How can thought which is the outcome of time, of self-protective activity comprehend that which is not of time?

We sometimes experience a state of tranquillity, of extraordinary clarity and joy, when the mind is serene and still. These moments come unexpectedly, without invitation. Such experiencing is not the result of calculated, disciplined thought. It occurs when thought is self-forgetful; when thought has ceased to become, when the mind is not in the conflict of its own self-created problems. So our problem is not how such a creative, joyous moment shall come and be maintained but how to bring about the cessation of self-expansive thought, which does not imply self-immolation but the transcending of the activities of the self. When a machine is revolving very fast, as a fan with several blades, the separate parts are not visible but appear as one. So the self, the me, seems to be a unified entity but if its activities can be slowed down then we shall perceive that it is not a unified entity but made up of



many separate and contending desires and pursuits. These separate wants and hopes, fears and joys make up the self. The self is a term to cover craving in its different forms. To understand the self there must be an awareness of craving in its multiple aspects. The passive awareness, the choiceless discernment reveal the ways of the self, bringing freedom from bondage. Thus when the mind is tranquil and free of its own activity and chatter, there is supreme wisdom.

Our problem then is how to free thought from its accumulated experiences, memories. How can this self cease to be? Deep and true experience takes place only when the activity of this intelligence ceases. We see that unless there is an experience of truth none of our problems can be solved whether sociological, religious or personal. Conflict cannot come to an end by merely rearranging frontiers or reorganizing economic values or imposing a new ideology; throughout the centuries we have tried these many ways but conflict and sorrow have continued. Till there is a comprehension of the Real, merely pruning the branches of our self-expansive activity is of little use, for the central problem remains unsolved. Till we discover Truth there is no way out of our sorrows and problems. The solution is the direct experience of Truth when the mind is still, in the tranquillity of awareness, in the openness of receptivity.

Questioner: Would you please explain again what you mean?

Krishnamurti: We often have religious experiences sometimes vague, sometimes definite; experiences of intense devotion or joy, of being deeply vulnerable, of fleeting unity with all things; we try to utilize these experiences in meeting our difficulties and sorrows.

These experiences are numerous but our thought, caught in time, turmoil and pain, tries to use them as stimulants to overcome our conflicts. So we say God or Truth will help us in our difficulties, but these experiences do not actually resolve our sorrow and confusion. Such moments of deep experience come when thought is not active in its self-protective memories; these experiences are independent of our striving and when we try to use them as stimulants for strength in our struggles, they only further the expansion of the self and its peculiar intelligence. So we come back to our question: how can this intelligence so sedulously cultivated cease? It can cease only through passive awareness.

Awareness is from moment to moment, it is not the cumulative effect of self-protective memories. Awareness is not determination nor is it the action of will. Awareness is the complete and unconditional surrender to what is, without rationalization, without the division of the observer and the observed. As awareness is non-accumulative, non-residual, it does not build up the self, positively or negatively. Awareness is ever in the present and so, non-identifying and non-repetitive; nor does it create habit.

Take, for instance, the habit of smoking and experiment with it in awareness. Be aware of smoking, do not condemn, rationalize or accept, simply be aware. If you are so aware there is the cessation of the habit; if you are so aware there will be no recurrence of it but if you are not aware the habit will persist. This awareness is not the determination to cease or to indulge.

Be aware; there is a fundamental difference between being and becoming. To become aware you make effort and effort implies resistance and time, and leads to conflict. If you are aware in the

moment there is no effort, no continuance of the self-protective intelligence. You are aware or you are not; the desire to be aware is only the activity of the sleeper, the dreamer. Awareness reveals the problem completely, fully, without denial or acceptance, justification or identification, and it is freedom which quickens understanding. Awareness is a unitary process of the observer and the observed.

Questioner: Can open, still receptivity of the mind come with the action of will or desire?

Krishnamurti: You may succeed in forcibly stilling the mind but what is the outcome of such effort? Death, is it not? You may succeed in silencing the mind but thought still remains petty, envious, contradictory, does it not? Through exertion, through an act of will we think an effortless state can be achieved in which we may experience the ecstasy of the Real. The experience of inexplicable joy or intense devotion or profound understanding comes only when there is effortless being.

Questioner: Are there not two kinds of intelligence, the one with which we function daily and the other which is higher, which guides, controls and is beneficial?

Krishnamurti: Does not the self for the sake of its own permanency divide itself into the high and the low, the controller and the controlled? Does not this division arise from the desire for continued self-expansion? However cunningly it might divide itself, the self is still the result of craving, it is still seeking different objectives through which to fulfil itself. A petty mind cannot possibly formulate something which is not also petty. The mind is essentially limited and whatever it creates is of itself. Its

gods, its values, its objectives and activities are narrow and measurable and so it cannot understand that which is not of itself, the Immeasurable.

Questioner: Can a petty thought go beyond itself?

Krishnamurti: How can it? Greed is still greed even if it reaches for heaven. Only when it is aware of its own limitation does the limited thought cease. The limited thought cannot become the free; when limitation ceases there is freedom. If you will experiment with awareness you will discover the truth of this.

It is the petty mind that creates problems for itself and through awareness of the cause of problems, the self, they are dissolved. To be aware of narrowness and its many results implies deep understanding of it on all the different levels of consciousness; pettiness in things, in relationship, in ideas. When we are conscious of being petty or violent or envious we make an effort not to be; we condemn it for we desire to be something else. This condemnatory attitude puts an end to the understanding of what is and its process. The desire to put an end to greed is another form of self-assertion and so is the cause of continued conflict and pain.

Questioner: What is wrong with purposeful thinking if it is logical?

Krishnamurti: If the thinker is unaware of himself though he may be purposeful, his logic will inevitably lead him to misery; if he is in authority, in a position of power, he brings misery and destruction upon others. That is what is happening in the world, is it not? Without self-knowledge thought is not based on Reality, it is ever in contradiction and its activities are mischievous and harmful.

To come back to our point: through awareness only can there be cessation of the cause of conflict. Be aware of any habit of thought or action; then you will recognize the rationalizing, condemnatory process which is preventing understanding. Through awareness - the reading of the book of habit page by page - comes self-knowledge. It is truth that frees, not your effort to be free. Awareness is the solution of our problems; we must experiment with it and discover its truth. It would be folly merely to accept; to accept is not to understand. Acceptance or non-acceptance is a positive act which hinders experimentation and understanding. Understanding that comes through experiment and self-knowledge brings confidence.

This confidence may be called faith. It is not the faith of the foolish; it is not faith in something. Ignorance may have faith in wisdom, darkness in light, cruelty in love, but such faith is still ignorance. This confidence or faith of which I am speaking comes through experimentation in self-knowledge, not through acceptance and hope. The self-confidence that many have is the outcome of ignorance, of achievement, of self-glory or of capacity. The confidence of which I speak is understanding, not the understand, but understanding without self-identification. The confidence or faith in something, however noble, breeds only obstinacy and obstinacy is another term for credulity. The clever ones have destroyed blind faith but when they themselves are in serious conflict or sorrow they accept faith or become cynical. To believe is not to be religious; to have faith in something which is created by the mind is not to be open to the Real. Confidence comes into being, it cannot be manufactured by the mind;

confidence comes with experiment and discovery; not the experiment with belief, theory or memory but experimentation with self-knowledge. This confidence or faith is not self-imposed nor is it identified with belief, formulation, hope. It is not the outcome of self-expanding desire. In experimenting with awareness there is a discovery which is freeing in its understanding. This self-knowledge through passive awareness is from moment to moment, without accumulation; it is endless, truly creative. Through awareness there comes vulnerability to Truth.

To be open, vulnerable to the Real, thought must cease to be accumulative. It is not that thought-feeling must become non-greedy, which is still accumulative, a negative form of self-expansion, but it must be non-greedy. A greedy mind is a conflicting mind; a greedy mind is ever fearful, envious in its self-growth and fulfillment. Such a mind is ever changing the objects of its desire and this changing is considered growth; a greedy mind which renounces the world in order to seek Reality, God, is still greedy; greed is ever restless, ever seeking growth, fulfillment, and this restless activity creates self-assertive intelligence but is not capable of understanding the Real.

Greed is a complex problem! To live in the world of greed without greed needs deep understanding; to live simply, earning a right livelihood in a world organized on economic aggression and expansion is possible only for those who are discovering inward riches.

Questioner: In the very act of coming here are we not seeking some spark to enlighten us?

Krishnamurti: What is it that you are seeking?

Questioner: Wisdom and knowledge.

Krishnamurti: Why do you seek?

Questioner: We are seeking to fill the deep, hidden inner void.

Krishnamurti: We are then seeking something to fill our emptiness; this filler we call knowledge, wisdom, truth and so on. So we are not seeking truth, wisdom, but something to fill our aching loneliness. If we can find that which can enrich our inward poverty we think our search will end. Now can anything fill this void? Some are painfully conscious of it and others are not; some have sought to escape through activity, through stimulation, through mysterious rituals, through ideologies and so on; others are conscious of this void but have not found a way of covering it up. Most of us know this fear, this panic of nothingness. We are seeking to overcome this fear, this emptiness; we are seeking something that can heal the aching agony of inner insufficiency. As long as you are convinced that you can find some escape you will go on seeking but is it not part of wisdom to see that all escape, no matter how alluring, is useless? When the truth about escape dawns on you will you persist in your search? Obviously not. Then we accept inevitably what is; this complete surrender to what is, is the liberating Truth, not the attainment of the objects of search.

Our life is conflict, pain; we crave security, permanency, but are caught in the net of the impermanent. We are the impermanent. Can the impermanent find the Eternal, the Timeless? Can illusion find Reality? Can ignorance find wisdom? Only with the cessation of the impermanent is there the permanent; with the cessation of ignorance is there wisdom. We are concerned with the cessation of the impermanent, the self.

Questioner: One of our great teachers has said, "Seek and ye shall find". Is it not advantageous to seek?

Krishnamurti: By this question we betray ourselves and how little we are aware of the ways of our thought. We are forever thinking of what is advantageous for us and that we desire. Do you think a mind that is seeking profit can find truth? If it is seeking truth as an advantage, then it is no longer seeking truth. Truth is beyond and above all personal advantage and gain. A mind that is seeking gain, achievement, can never find Truth. The search for gain is for security, for refuge, and Truth is not a security, a refuge. Truth is the liberator, sweeping away all refuge and security.

Besides, why do you seek? Is it not because you are in confusion and pain? Instead of seeking an escape through activity, through psychologists, through priests, through rituals, must you not search out the cause of conflict and sorrow in yourself? The cause is the self, craving. The deliverance from confusion and pain is in yourself and not another can free you.

Questioner: If we can open our consciousness to truth is that not sufficient?

Krishnamurti: We revert to this question in different ways over and over again. Can the mind, the self-consciousness, which is the product of time, understand or experience the Timeless? When the mind seeks will it find Reality, God? When the mind asserts that it must be open to Reality is it capable of being so?

If thought is aware that it is the product of ignorance, of the limited self, then there is a possibility for it to cease formulating, imagining, being occupied with itself. Only through awareness can thought transcend itself, not through will, which is another form of



self-expansive desire. When are we joyous? Is it the result of calculation, of an act of will? It happens when conflicting problems and demands of desire are absent. As a lake is calm when the winds stop so the mind is still when craving with its problems ceases. The mind cannot induce itself to be quiet, to be still; the lake is not calm till the winds cease. Till the problems the self creates cease there can be no tranquillity. The mind has to understand itself and not try to escape into illusion, or seek something that it is incapable of experiencing or understanding.

Questioner: Is there a technique for being aware?

Krishnamurti: What does this question imply? You seek a method by which you may learn to be aware. Awareness is not the result of practice, habit or time. As a tooth that causes intense pain has to be attended to immediately so sorrow, if intense, demands urgent alleviation. But instead we seek an escape or explain it away; we avoid the real issue which is the self. Because we are not facing our conflict, our sorrow, we assure ourselves lazily that we must make an effort to be aware and so we demand a technique for becoming aware.

So it is not by an act of will that truth is uncovered but through tranquil vulnerability the Real comes into being.

## OJAI 5TH PUBLIC TALK 1946

We have been considering the problem of intelligence, that intelligence which has been developed during the course of self-assertive struggles and self-protective pursuits, of acquisitive demands and imitative conformities; we saw that with that intelligence we hoped to solve our conflicts and discover or experience Truth or God. Can that intelligence ever experience the Real? If it cannot then how can it come to an end or be transformed? We saw that this is possible only through passive awareness and that we can at any time be aware without the will to become aware. To understand what is implied in awareness we examined greed and tried to understand its activities; greed not only for the tangible but also for power, for authority; greed for affection, for knowledge, for service and so on; we saw that we either condemn or justify greed thereby identifying ourselves with it. We saw, too, that awareness is a process of discovery which becomes blocked through identification. When we are rightly aware of greed in its complexity there is no struggle against it, no negative assertion of non-greed, which is only another form of self-assertiveness; and in that awareness we will find that greed has ceased.

Awareness is not the result of practice for practice implies the formation of habit; habit is the denial of awareness. Awareness is of the moment and not a cumulative result. To say to ourselves that we shall become aware is not to be aware. To say that we are going to be non-greedy is merely to continue to be greedy, to be unaware of it.

How do we approach a complex problem? We do not surely meet complexity with complexity; we must approach it simply and the greater our simplicity the greater will be the clarification. To understand and experience Reality there must be utter simplicity and tranquillity. When we suddenly see a magnificent scenery or come upon a great thought, or listen to great music, we are utterly still. Our minds are not simple but to recognize complexity is to be simple. If you would understand yourself, your complexity, there must be open receptivity, the simplicity of non-identification. But we are not aware of beauty or complexity and so we chatter endlessly.

Questioner: We must not criticize then if we are to be aware?

Krishnamurti: Without probing deeply into oneself self-knowledge is not possible. What do we mean by self-criticism? The function of the mind is to probe and to comprehend. Without this probing into ourselves, without this deep awareness, there can be no understanding. We often indulge in the stupidity of criticizing others but few are capable of probing deeply into themselves. The function of the mind is not only to probe, to delve, but also to be silent. In silence there is comprehension. We are ever probing but we are rarely silent; in us rarely are there alert, passive intervals of tranquillity; we probe and are soon weary of it without the creative silence. But self-probing is as essential for the clarity of understanding as is stillness. As the earth is allowed to lie fallow during the winter so must thought be still after deep searching. This very fallowness is its renewal. If we delve deeply into ourselves and are still then in this stillness, in this openness, there is understanding.

Questioner: This complexity is so deep that one does not seem to have an opportunity for quietness.

Krishnamurti: Must there be an opportunity to be still, to be quiet? Must you create the occasion, the right environment to be peaceful? Is it then peace? With right probing there comes right stillness. When do you look into yourself? When the problem demands it, when it is urgent, surely. But if you are seeking an opportunity to be silent then you are not aware. Self-probing comes with conflict and sorrow, and there must be passive receptivity to understand. Surely self-probing, stillness and understanding are in awareness a single process and not three separate states.

Questioner: Would you enlarge that point?

Krishnamurti: Let us take envy. Any resolution not to be envious is neither simple nor effective, it is even stupid. To determine not to be envious is to build walls of conclusions around oneself and these walls prevent understanding. But if you are aware you will discover the ways of envy; if there is interested alertness you will find its ramifications at different levels of the self. Each probing brings with it silence and understanding; as one cannot continuously probe deeply, which would only result in exhaustion, there must be spaces of alert inactivity. This watchful stillness is not the outcome of weariness; with self-probing there come easily and naturally moments of passive alertness. The more complex the problem the more intense is the probing and the silence. There need be no specially created occasion or opportunity for silence; the very perception of the complexity of a problem brings with it deep silence.

Our difficulty lies in that we have built around ourselves

conclusions which we call understanding. These conclusions are hindrances to understanding. If you go into this more deeply you will see that there must be complete abandonment of all that has been accumulated for the being of understanding and wisdom. To be simple is not a conclusion, an intellectual concept for which you strive. There can be simplicity only when the self with its accumulation ceases. It is comparatively easy to renounce family, property, fame, things of the world; that is only a beginning; but it is extremely difficult to put away all knowledge, all conditioned memory. In this freedom, this aloneness, there is experience which is beyond and above all creations of the mind. Do not let us ask whether the mind ever can be free from conditioning, from influence; we shall find this out as we proceed in self-knowledge and understanding. Thought which is a result cannot understand the Causeless.

The ways of accumulation are subtle; accumulation is self-assertiveness, as is imitation. To come to a conclusion is to build a wall around oneself, a protective security which prevents understanding. Accumulated conclusions do not make for wisdom but only sustain the self. Without accumulation there is no self. A mind weighed down with accumulations is incapable of following the swift movement of life, incapable of deep and pliable awareness. Questioner: Are you not encouraging separateness, individualism?

Krishnamurti: He who is influenced is separate, knowing the division of the high and the low, of merit and demerit. Aloneness in the sense of being free from influence is not separative, not antagonizing. It is a state to be experienced, not speculated upon.

The self is ever separative, it is the cause of division, conflict and sorrow. Do you not feel separate; are not your activities those of a self-assertive, self-expansive individual? Obviously your thoughts and activities are now individualistic, narrow; it is your work, your achievement, your country, your belief, even your God. You are separate and so your social structure is based on self-assertiveness which causes untold misery and destruction; you may assert we are all one but in actual daily life your activities are separative, individualistic, competitive, ruthless, leading ultimately to war and misery.

If we are aware of this self-aggressive process in ourselves and understand its implications then there is a possibility of bring about a peaceful and happy relationship between man and man. The very awareness of what is, is a liberative process. So long as we are unaware of what we are, and are trying to become something else, so long will there be distortion and pain. The very awareness of what I am brings about transformation and the freedom of understanding.

Questioner: Cannot one think about the Uncreated, about Reality, God?

Krishnamurti: The created cannot think about the Uncreated. It can think only about its own projection which is not the Real. Can thought which is the result of time, of influence, of imitation, think about that which is not measurable? It can only think about that which is known. What is knowable is not the Real, what is known is ever receding into the past and what is past is not the Eternal. You may speculate upon the unknown but you cannot think about it. When you think about something you are probing into it,

subjecting it to different moods and influences. But such thinking is not meditation. Creativeness is a state of being which is not the outcome of thinking. Right meditation opens the door to the Real.

But let us go back to what we were considering. Are we aware that our so-called thinking is the result of influence, of conditioning, of imitation? Are you not influenced by propaganda, religious or secular, by the politician and the priest, by the economist and the advertiser? Collective worship and regimentation of thought are alike and both hinder the discovery and experience of Reality. Propaganda is not the instrument of Truth, whether of organized religion or politics or business. If we would discover Truth we must be aware of the subtleties of influence, of challenge and of our response. Learning a technique, a method, does not lead to creative being. When the past ceases to influence the present, when time ceases, there is creative being which can be experienced only in deep meditation.

Questioner: Is not thinking the initial step to creativeness?

Krishnamurti: The initial step is to be self-aware. Our thinking, as we said, is the result of the past; it is the result of conditioning, of imitation; that being so all effort it makes to free itself is vain. All it can do and must do is be aware of its own conditioning and cause; through the understanding of the cause there comes freedom from it. If we were aware of our stupidity, ignorance then there would be a possibility of wisdom; but to consider stupidity as a necessary beginning for intelligence is wrong thinking. If we recognize that we are stupid then that very recognition is the beginning of thoughtfulness; but recognizing it, if we try to become clever, then that very becoming is another form of

stupidity.

Any definite pattern of thought prevents understanding.

Understanding is not substitution; mere change of patterns, of conclusions, does not yield understanding. Understanding comes with self-awareness and self-knowledge. There is no substitute for self-knowledge. Is it not important first to understand oneself, to be aware of one's own conditioning rather than seek understanding outside of oneself? Understanding comes with the awareness of what is.

Questioner: Being imitative what shall we do?

Krishnamurti: Be self-aware which will reveal the hidden motives of imitation, envy, fear, the craving for security, for power and so on. This awareness when free of self-identification brings understanding and tranquillity which lead to the realization of supreme wisdom.

Questioner: Is not this process of awareness, of self-unfoldment another form of acquisition? Is not probing another means of self-expansive acquisitiveness?

Krishnamurti: If the questioner experimented with awareness he would discover the truth about his question. Understanding is never accumulative; understanding comes only when there is stillness, when there is passive alertness. There is no stillness, no passivity when the mind is acquisitive; acquisitiveness is ever restless, envious. As we said, awareness is not cumulative; through identification accumulation is built up, giving continuity to the self through memory. To be aware without self-identification, without condemnation or justification is extremely arduous, for our response is based on pleasure and pain, reward and punishment.



How few are aware of constant identification; if we were we would not ask these questions which indicate unawareness. As a sleeper dreams that he must awaken but does not, for it is only a dream, so we are asking these questions without actually experimenting with awareness.

Questioner: Is there anything that one can do to be aware?

Krishnamurti: Are you not in conflict, in sorrow? If you are do you not search out its cause? The cause is the self, its torturing desires. To struggle with these desires only creates resistance, further pain, but if you are choicelessly aware of your craving then there comes creative understanding. It is the truth of this understanding that liberates, not your struggle against resistance to envy, anger, pride and so on. So awareness is not an act of will for will is resistance, the effort made by the self through desire to acquire, to grow, whether positively or negatively. Be aware of acquisitiveness, passively observing its ways on different levels; you will find this rather arduous, for thought-feeling sustains itself on identification and it is this which prevents the understanding of accumulation.

Be aware take the journey of self-discovery. Do not ask what is going to happen on this journey which only betrays anxiety, fear, indicating your desire for security, for certainty. This desire for refuge prevents self-knowledge, self-unfoldment and so, understanding. Be aware of this inward anxiety and directly experience it; then you will discover what this awareness reveals. But unfortunately most of you only desire to talk about the journey without undertaking it.

Questioner: What happens to us at the end of the journey?

Krishnamurti: Is it not important for the questioner to be aware of why he is asking this question? Is it not because of the fear of the unknown, the desire to gain an end, or the assurance of self-continuity? Being in sorrow we seek happiness; being impermanent we search after the permanent; being in darkness we look for light. But if we were aware of what is, then the truth of sorrow, of impermanency, of imprisonment would liberate thought from its own ignorance. Questioner: Is there no such thing as creative thinking?

Krishnamurti: It would be rather vain to consider what is creativeness. If we were aware of our conditioning then the truth of this would bring about creative being. To speculate upon creative being is a hindrance; all speculation is a hindrance to understanding. Only when the mind is simple, purged of all self-deception and cunning, cleansed of all accumulation, is there the Real. The purgation of the mind is not an act of will nor the outcome of imitative compulsion. Awareness of what is, is liberating.

## OJAI 6TH PUBLIC TALK 1946

As this is the last talk of this series perhaps it might be well to make a brief summary of what we have been considering during the past five Sundays. We have been discussing whether the process of what we call intelligence can resolve any of our problems and sorrows; whether the ant-like activity which has developed self-protective intelligence can bring about enlightenment and peace.

This activity on the surface, called intelligence, cannot resolve our many difficulties for within there is still confusion, turmoil and darkness. This intelligence has been developed through the expansion of the self, the ego, the me and the mine; this activity is the outcome of inner insufficiency, incompleteness. Outwardly thought is active, building and destroying, contradicting and modifying, renewing and suppressing; but within there is void and despair. The outer activity of plastic and steel, reform and counter reform, is ever lost in the inward emptiness and confusion. You may build wonderful structures or organize spaciouly over a smoldering volcano but what you construct is soon smothered by ashes and destroyed. So this expansive activity of the self, this intelligence, however alert, capable and industrious, cannot penetrate through its own darkness to Reality. This intelligence cannot at any time resolve its own conflicts and miseries for they are the outcome of its own activity. This intelligence is incapable of discovering Truth and only Truth can free us from ever increasing conflicts and sorrows.

We further considered how this self-expansive intelligence is to

cease reshaping itself negatively. Whether positive or negative, the activity of craving is still within the framework of the self and can this activity ever come to an end? We said that only through self-awareness can this accumulative intelligence of the self cease. We saw this awareness to be from moment to moment, without cumulative power; that in this awareness self-identification-condemnation- modification cannot take place and so there is deep and full understanding. We said that this awareness is not progressive but an instantaneous perception and that the thought of progressive becoming prevents immediate clarification.

This morning we shall consider meditation. In understanding it we can perhaps comprehend the full and deep significance of passive awareness. Awareness is right meditation and without meditation there can be no self-knowledge. Earnestness in the discovery of one's motives is more important than to seek out a method of meditation. The more earnest one is the more capacity one has to probe and to perceive. So it is essential to be earnest rather than to form and pursue a conclusion, to be earnest rather than arbitrarily hold to an intention. If we merely hold to an intention, a conclusion, a resolution, thought becomes narrow, obstinate, fixed, but if there is earnestness this very quality is capable of deep penetration. The difficulty is in being constantly earnest. Spiritual window shopping is not an indication of seriousness. If you have the capacity to allow thought to unroll itself fully then you will perceive that one thought contains, or is related to, all thought. There is no need to go from teacher to teacher, from guru to guru, from leader to leader, for all things are contained in you, the beginning and the end. None can help you to

discover the Real; no ritual, no collective worship, no authority can help you. Another may point out the direction but to make of him an authority, a gateway to the Real, a necessity, is to be ignorant, which breeds fear and superstition.

To delve deeply within oneself and discover needs earnestness. This probing we consider tedious, uninspiring, so we depend upon stimulants, Masters, saviours, leaders, to encourage us to understand ourselves. This encouragement or stimulation becomes a necessity, an addiction, and weakens the quality of earnestness. Being in contradiction and sorrow we think we are incapable of finding a solution so we look to another or try to find the answer in a book. To look within demands earnest application which is not brought about through the practice of any method. It comes through serious interest and awareness. If one is interested in something thought pursues it, consciously or unconsciously, in spite of fatigue and distraction. If you are interested in painting then every light, every shade has meaning; you do not have to exert to be interested, you do not have to force yourself to observe but through the very intensity of interest even unconsciously you are observing, discovering, experiencing. Similarly if there is an interest in the comprehension and dissolution of sorrow then that very interest turns the pages of the book of self-knowledge. To have a goal, an end to be achieved, prevents self-knowledge; earnest awareness reveals the ways of the self. Without self-knowledge there can be no understanding; self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. Our thought is the result of the past; our thinking is based on the past, upon conditioning. Without comprehending this past there is no understanding of the Real. The

comprehension of the past lies through the present. The Real is not the reward for self-knowledge. The Real is Causeless and thought that has cause cannot experience it. Without a foundation there can be no lasting structure and the right foundation for understanding is self-knowledge. So all right thinking is the outcome of self-knowledge. If I do not know myself how can I understand anything else? For without self-knowledge all knowledge is in vain. Without self-knowledge incessant activity is of ignorance; this incessant activity, inner or outer, only causes destruction and misery.

Understanding of the ways of the self leads to freedom. Virtue is freedom, orderliness; without order, freedom, there can be no experiencing of the Real. In virtue there is freedom, not in the becoming virtuous. The desire to become, negatively or positively, is self-expansive and in the expansion of the self there can be no freedom.

Questioner: You said the Real should not be an incentive. It seems to me that if I try to think of the Real I am better able to understand myself and my difficulties.

Krishnamurti: Is it possible to think about the Real? We may be able to formulate, imagine, speculate upon what we consider the Real to be but is it the Real? Can we think about the unknowable? Can we think, meditate upon the Timeless when our thought is the result of the past, of time? The past is ever the Mown and thought which is based on it can only create the known. So to think about Truth is to be caught in the net of ignorance. If thought is able to think about Truth then it will not be Truth. Truth is a state of being in which the so-called activity of thought has ceased. Thinking, as we know it, is the result of the self-expansive process of time, of

the past; it is the result of the movement of the known to the known. Thought which is the outcome of a cause can never formulate the Causeless. It can only think about the known for it is the product of the known.

What is known is not the Real. Our thought is occupied with the constant search for security, for certainty. Self-expansive intelligence by its very nature craves a refuge, either through negation or assertion. How can a mind that is ever seeking certainty, stimulation, encouragement, possibly think of that which is illimitable? You may read about it which is unfortunate, you may verbalize it which is a waste of time, but it is not the Real. When you say that by thinking about Truth you can better solve your difficulties and sorrows, you are using the supposed truth as a palliative; as with all drugs, sleep and dullness soon follow. Why seek external stimulants when the problem demands an understanding of its maker?

As I was saying, virtue gives freedom but there is no freedom in becoming virtuous. There is a vast and unbridgeable difference between being and becoming.

Questioner: Is there a difference between truth and virtue?

Krishnamurti: Virtue gives freedom for thought to be tranquil, to experience the Real. So virtue is not an end in itself, only Truth is. To be a slave to passion is to be without freedom and in freedom alone can there be discovery and experience of the Real. Greed like anger is a disturbing factor, is it not? Envy is ever restless, never still. Craving is ever changing the object of its fulfillment, from things to passion, to virtue, to the idea of God. The greed for Reality is the same as the greed for possessions.

Craving comes through perception, contact, sensation; desire seeks fulfillment so there is identification, the me and the mine. Being satiated with things desire pursues other forms of gratification, more subtle forms of fulfillment in relationship, in knowledge, in virtue, in the realization of God. Craving is the root cause of all conflict and sorrow. All forms of becoming, negative or positive, cause conflict, resistance.

Questioner: Is there any difference between awareness and that of which we are aware? Is the observer different from his thoughts?

Krishnamurti: The observer and the observed are one; the thinker and his thoughts are one. To experience the thinker and his thought as one is very arduous for the thinker is ever taking shelter behind his thought; he separates himself from his thoughts to safeguard himself, to give himself continuity, permanency; he modifies or changes his thoughts, but he remains. This pursuit of thought apart from himself, this changing, transforming it leads to illusion. The thinker is his thought; the thinker and his thoughts are not two separate processes.

The questioner asks if awareness is different from the object of awareness. We generally regard our thoughts as being apart from ourselves; we are not aware of the thinker and his thought as one. This is precisely the difficulty. After all, the qualities of the self are not separate from the self; the self is not something apart from its thoughts, from its attributes. The self is put together, made up, and the self is not when the parts are dissolved. But in illusion the self separates itself from its qualities in order to protect itself, to give itself continuity, permanency. It takes refuge in its qualities



through separating itself from them. The self asserts that it is this and it is that; the self, the I, modifies, changes, transforms its thoughts, its qualities, but this change only gives strength to the self, to its protective walls. But if you are aware deeply you will perceive that the thinker and his thoughts are one; the observer is the observed. To experience this actual integrated fact is extremely difficult and right meditation is the way to this integration.

Questioner: How can I be on the defence against aggression without action? Morality demands that we should do something against evil?

Krishnamurti: To defend is to be aggressive. Should you fight evil by evil? Through wrong means can right be established? Can there be peace in the world by murdering those who are murderers? As long as we divide ourselves into groups, nationals, different religions and ideologies there will be the aggressor and the defender. To be without virtue is to be without freedom, which is evil. This evil cannot be overcome by another evil, by another opposing desire.

Questioner: Experiencing is not necessarily a becoming is it?

Krishnamurti: Additive process prevents the experiencing of the Real. Where there is accumulation there is a becoming of the self which is the cause of conflict and pain. The accumulative desire for pleasure and the avoidance of pain is a becoming. Awareness is non-accumulative for it is ever discovering truth and truth can only be when there is no accumulation, when there is no imitation. Effort of the self can never bring about freedom for effort implies resistance and resistance can be dissolved only through choiceless awareness, effortless discernment. It is truth alone that frees, not

the activity of will. The awareness of truth is liberating; the awareness of greed and of the truth about it brings liberation from greed.

Meditation is the purgation from the mind of all its accumulations; the purgation of the power to gather, to identify, to become; the purgation of self-growth of self-fulfilment; meditation is the freeing of the mind from memory, from time. Thought is the product of the past, it is rooted in the past; thought is the continuation of accumulative becoming, and that which is a result cannot understand or experience that which is without a cause. What can be formulated is not the Real and the word is not the experience. Memory, the maker of time, is an impediment to the Timeless.

Questioner: Why is memory an impediment? Krishnamurti: Memory, as the identifying process, gives continuity to the self. Memory then is an enclosing, hindering activity. On it the whole structure of the ego, the I, is built. We are considering psychological memory not the memory for speech, facts, for the development of technique and so on. Any activity of the self is an impediment to truth; any activity or education that conditions the mind through nationalism, through identification with a group, an ideology, a dogma, is an impediment to Truth.

Conditioned knowledge is a hindrance to Reality. Understanding comes with the cessation of all activity of the mind - when the mind is utterly free, silent, tranquil. Craving is ever accumulative and time-binding; desire for a goal, knowledge, experience, growth, fulfillment and even the desire for God or Truth is an impediment. The mind must purge itself of all its self-

created impediments for supreme wisdom to be.

Meditation as it is generally understood and practised is a process of the expansion of the self; often meditation is a form of self-hypnosis. In so-called meditation effort very often is directed towards becoming like a Master, which is imitation. All such meditation leads to illusion.

The craving for achievement demands a technique, a method, practice of which is considered meditation. Through compulsion imitation and through the formation of new habits and disciplines, there will be no freedom, no understanding; through the means of time the Timeless is not experienced. The change of the objects of desire does not bring release from conflict and sorrow. Will is self-expansive intelligence and the activity of will to be or not to be, to gather or renounce, is still of the self. To be aware of the process of craving with its accumulative memory is to experience Truth which is the only liberator.

Awareness flows into meditation; in meditation, Being, the Eternal, is experienced. Becoming can never transform itself into Being. Becoming, the expansive and enclosing activity of the self, must cease; then there is Being. This Being cannot be thought about, cannot be imagined; the very thought about it is a hindrance; all that thought can do is to be aware of its own complex and subtle becoming, its own cunning intelligence and will. Through self-knowledge there comes right thinking which is the foundation for right meditation. Meditation should not be confused with prayer. Supplicatory prayer does not lead to supreme wisdom for it ever maintains the division between self and the Other.

In silence, in supreme tranquillity when the restless activity of

memory has ceased, there is the Immeasurable, the Eternal.

## **MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 22ND OCTOBER, 1947**

As I am going to talk every Sunday for many Sundays, I think it will be best if I very carefully and slowly develop the ideas which I have. I shall try to make my points as clear as possible during this and subsequent talks every Sunday at 5 p.m.

Most of us are used to listening to talks, and I hope you will not reduce these talks to the level of mere talks to which you attend and which are of no consequence afterwards in your daily life, because I feel that at the present time the world is in such chaos, in such a mess in such an extraordinary catastrophic strain that it requires a new outlook, a revolutionary way of thinking about the problems that surround us every day. So it seems to me that it is very important that we, every one of us should understand the catastrophe that is around us. Verbally we are aware that there is a catastrophe. We read about it in the newspapers, in the magazines. Every person we talk to makes us aware of the approaching catastrophe. If you look at it more closely, you will see that there is chaos and confusion in the political world, and the leaders are themselves confused. Not only here, but everywhere. When talking about the catastrophe, I am not talking about the Indian catastrophe only. India is only a part of the whole world and therefore to regard the Indian problem as the only problem seems to me to be out of proportion and gives it a false emphasis which it does not have. So, this is a world problem and we must look at it in the large and not in the particular. We must see the whole picture and not a part of it and our difficulty will be to see the whole rather than the

particular. Because we are surrounded by the national, by the immediate, it seems to me that to understand it, we must approach it not from the particular but must try to understand the catastrophe that exists around us. So, I always say that there is a crisis in every phase of our life, physically, religiously, socially and educationally. Politically we see that there is no solution through nationalism, through division of peoples and through separate Governments. But, we see that the contrary is taking place. We had our faith in the League of Nations, but that failed and we see the U. N.O. quickly failing. So we look to the political leaders to solve our difficulties.

In the religious field also it is the same. We can almost say that religion has failed. The organized religions throughout the world, whether the Christian, the Hindu, or the Buddhist, have nothing real to say about this enormous catastrophe. And this catastrophe is not temporary, not a passing one, not one of those economic crises as in 1929 and various other social upheavals that took place. A catastrophe like this happens very rarely. It is a catastrophe of the highest degree and if you had talks or discussions with many people, you would discover that this catastrophe cannot be compared with any that happened before. Perhaps there have been one or two other catastrophes similar to this, but the fundamental values have been destroyed and new ones have to be created. If you are a student of history and if you look at it you will find that there have been but one or two such enormous catastrophes as the present one.

We have to consider Man as a whole: psychologically, sociologically and economically. Everything is uncertain and we

are all trying to solve this problem on our own special level. That is, the economist tries to solve the economic problem on his own level and his own plane and therefore he can never have a solution for it. Again, the politician tries to solve it on his own level and he will never succeed, because the economic crisis, the political crisis, the various problems that surround us every day have to be solved on a different plane and that is where I feel revolution must take place.

So, as this crisis is extraordinary, most people try to solve it by formulae, by systems either of the extreme left or of the extreme right. We have a formula either of the left or of the right or something in between both and we try to apply it to solve the difficulty. It is so, is it not? If you are a socialist, you have the formula and with that formula you approach the problem and with that formula you try to solve it. But you notice it, But you notice that you can only solve a static problem by a formula and no problem is ever static because there are so many influences, so many actions upon it, that it is constantly changing. And therefore, no formula of any kind can ever solve a dynamic problem. And yet that is what we are trying to do. The left and the right are trying to solve it within the framework of certain formulae, certain set ideas. But the formulae can never solve anything. Systems have never solved anything, nor brought about a revolution. A revolution has been brought about by creative thinkers, not by mere followers. So what is required at the present time, I feel, is not a new formula, not a new system, neither of the left nor of the right, but a different approach, and that is important. If you have a problem what matters is how you approach it. If you approach it with a fixed

mentality, with set ideas, you will not solve the problem, because the problem is not static. It is constantly undergoing a change and the fact that it cannot be solved by mere formulae seems to be obvious and I hope it will be obvious to you by the time I finish with these talks.

What I feel important in this is that each one of us should solve this problem and not leave it to the leaders. This problem, this catastrophe requires, not static thinking but revolutionary thinking, a thinking which is not based on any ideology, whether of Hinduism, Nationalism or Capitalism. It requires a change in our thinking. And so, the approach to the problem becomes all important. The 'how' is more important than 'action'. So, to know how to approach this catastrophe is more important than what to do about it. That 'how' can only be understood, when we are capable of looking at the problem through ourselves and not through formula. That is, as it is a world catastrophe, it requires a mind that is capable of looking at it without any prejudice. You cannot look at it as a Brahmin or as a Mussalman, as a Christian or as a Buddhist. Because we have looked at it in the past in this way we have brought about this crisis. Because of tradition and other absurdities among us, we have brought about this problem and if we approach the problem with the same mentality, we shall not clarify or understand it, but only further it. It is, as if we were standing near a precipice with our minds biased, and we have come to that bias through centuries of division, communal and social, rich and poor; divisions of formulae, organized religious divisions and so on have brought us to this appalling misery and 'confusion'. If we would understand it, we must go away from the precipice and



look at the problem. We cannot stand at the precipice, at the edge of the precipice and try to solve the problem. On the contrary, we must completely abandon those causes which have brought us to that stage and look at the problem from a distance and that is where our difficulty is. We know the catastrophe, we know the sociological causes of the wars that have been fought and the wars that are going to be fought. Preparations are going on with marvellous skill for the third war and you and I know that is the edge of the precipice. I do not think India is going to escape from it. Most of us realize, how comparatively serious the whole thing is. We read about it all in the papers but are distracted away by our immediate demands and pleasures and pains. But the catastrophe is enormously serious and that is why if we would salvage something out of this catastrophe, we would become very serious and feel sorry for the absurdities of class divisions and the like. If the problem were serious enough we would do something about it. If you had a toothache you would do something immediately. But this pain is much greater and more grievous than a toothache. It is more continuous, more distant and that is why we are doing nothing. We are looking to leaders, gurus, formulae, systems, etc., we look either to Moscow or to Washington. So, we are at the edge of it and we have to confront it.

This catastrophe has been brought about by each one of us. We are confused within us and that confusion manifests itself in the outer. So, each one, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, is responsible for this misery. Neither the capitalist nor the socialist can escape from it, and each one is responsible for it. Since we have brought about this catastrophe, each one of us is responsible

and must confront it. That is what is called bringing about a new way of thinking, a new way of looking and therefore it is important to realize how extraordinarily vital is an individual at the present time. Please differentiate between the individual and individualistic action. Individualistic action takes place when the individual acts as a part and not as a whole. That is, when he is thinking in terms of power, greed and position, then he is acting individualistically. This has led to this crisis, and when he acts as a whole being, that is, individually, then such an action has immense significance. We will discuss this as we go along, every Sunday.

What I want to do this evening is more or less briefly and simply to put to you in resume the formulation of some of these ideas. So, as I say, since the individual is confused, you are confused. Since you as an individual are confused you are bound to spread confusion. Your State, your Government, your Religion, each one of these is bound to be confused because you are the State and you bring about your Society. The Society is the relationship between two individuals and that Society that is produced shares the greed, the lust for power and all the rest of it. So the confusion is in us and it projects itself in action into the world and we create the world crisis. After all war is only an outward and spectacular result of our daily life. So, if we do not transform our daily life and bear responsibility for it, not superficially but fundamentally, really and profoundly, we cannot escape from this chaos that is coming. And therefore, for me, the importance of the individual is supreme, but not as the individual in opposition to Society, in opposition to the whole. I think we should be very clear about this point. When we regard the individual and his function in society we have to

consider the individual as a whole and not only the individual's activity which may be antisocial. It is a worldwide problem and it is exactly the same in America, in Europe and Damascus. I heard two Syrians talking about this problem in French in the same way as you and I talk here. Because you and I have brought about this catastrophe, we should be responsible for it, because no leader, no guru, no politician, no teacher is going to save us. Since the problem is vital and is constantly undergoing change, no formulae can solve it.

So what is required is right thinking. Right thinking is not a formula. It is not based on any system. Right thinking can only take place when there is self-knowledge, that is, when the individual understands his total position and that is where we will find the greatest difficulty. To understand something requires an intensity, an unnatural intellectual intensity. Your approach is going to be the most difficult job as you are not used to thinking as a whole but only used to thinking compartmentally. So right thinking seems to me to be the solution for the present chaos and right thinking cannot come either through any formula or through following anybody. Right thinking can only take place through self-knowledge, that is, knowing yourself. To know yourself you have to study yourself. If one is to understand oneself he must cease to condemn. If you understand something you must not compare it with something else. You must study it by itself. If you would understand it you must not judge or condemn or identify yourself with it. If you would understand and if you condemn, surely you would put a stop to understanding altogether. If you would understand yourself the whole process being physiological as well

as psychological we must approach it without condemnation which is an extraordinarily difficult task. I do not know if you have ever tried it or experimented with it yourself, to see how far you can understand yourself.

The religious person will state that he is god, and the extreme left-winger that he is nothing but a set of reactions. Therefore they have reached conclusions and stopped all real thinking; their actions are not based on right thinking and therefore not resulting from self-knowledge. Self-knowledge is not possible if there is any sense of condemnation or identification. In other words, relationship with one or with the many is a process of self-revolution through self-knowledge. And it is only right thinking which can create a new set of values which will completely, supersede the false set of values, not by replacing old values with new formulae, but with the values that you have discovered and which were not handed down to you by a guru, by a political leader, by a swami, by this or that person, values that you have through your self-awareness discovered. It is in the present there is right thinking and that is going to solve the world-chaos and that means you have to withdraw from the base and become a centre of right thinking. Surely this is what has happened always in those moments, in those times when the world had to face such crises. There were a few who, seeing the confusion and the impossibility of altering that catastrophe, withdrew and formed groups. Who is going to take the trouble nowadays to settle down and very seriously think of the whole problem? Those who study, study by a formula, limited by conditioning. But there are very few who study the chaos without a system, without being conditioned and it is they who are going to

save, because they will be the creators and I hope that during these coming weeks it will be possible for us to be really serious, to discover this creative thinking, which is the real discovery of truth, but this creation cannot be formulated. What is creation? Deep meditation and self-abnegation, as it is to most of us? Because we create an image and live in that image that is not God. We invite Reality, but Reality cannot be invited. It must come. To let it come there must be the right feeling, that is, mind must put away all the things that it knows, which is an enormously difficult task and without that reality, whatever action we do on the precipice is futile. So it is my intention, during my talks, to consider with those who are really serious and help them to experience directly this creative reality.

To do that we shall have to arrange discussions every other day here between 7:30 in the morning and 9.00. But what is important in these talks and discussions is to be really earnest, because earnestness is not a matter created, a matter of environmental cause. Then earnestness becomes merely transient. But if we realize this chaos, misery and appalling suffering, it will make us serious. And it is this seriousness and earnestness that are required, to solve this problem.

I have been given two or three questions and I shall try to answer them.

Question: The communist believes that on guaranteeing food, clothing and shelter to every individual and abolishing private property a state can be created in which we can live happily. What do you say about it?

Krishnamurti: I wonder what you would say? I also wonder

whether you have ever thought about this problem. it will be extraordinarily interesting to find out what you would think about it. it is your problem also because we do need clothes, food and shelter. We need to organize that on a world-scale not just on a communal scale, which means we need people who are not thinking in terms of nationalism etc., but thinking in terms of man. Not in terms of formulae but in terms of human happiness, and not as the people that have and the people that have not. There are millions and millions without any food, clothing and shelter not only in this country, but in Germany, in America and all over the world, and the communist says that we have the means to solve this problem and that is your responsibility to do. Those of you who believe in God, in religion, what is your response? You must have a reply? Since all of you cannot reply I have to go on.

Obviously we have to organize a world-pool of food, clothing and shelter so that every human being in the world has enough, and I assure you it can be done, if scientists devote their time to it. They are at present interested only in destroying each other, in the discovery of the atomic power. So if there are means to produce enough food, enough shelter, enough clothing for all human beings, why is it not possible? Because each one wants to be at the head of distribution. Each nation wants to be at the top. Surely, it is so simple to organize for the whole of man whether American, Hindu or any other, enough clothing and shelter but that is prevented by greed and when we are capable of getting rid of greed we can organize it. But it is not so simple. Life is much more complex than distributing to the few or organizing for the many. In the organizing for the many, the psychological, the hidden factors

come into being and therefore life is not dependent on 'bread alone' but on a much greater factor that controls bread. 'We do not live by bread alone'. We live by far deeper psychological factors which must be taken into account before we can organize and bring about a change not based upon any formula. What is required is to understand these new psychological factors which are brought into being and which transform our lives.

And so man does not live by bread alone but by deeper factors and if we do not study those deeper factors and understand them it is impossible to organize the distribution of food, clothing and shelter for all. So where do we lay the emphasis? Surely that is an important question. Is it on bread or on those subtle hidden factors which dominate and are capable of organizing for bread. Where is your emphasis? Obviously in a man who is really wanting to provide food, clothes or shelter and not merely on an amazing formula or creed. It is surely the psychological factor that is more important than bread. I am not laying down anything dogmatically. We can discuss this during the coming several weeks. But if we merely adhered to the formula with all its implications, then as has been over and over again proved by history, it would be futile.

After all what is the State? What is Government? It represents the relationship of individuals. If our relationship is based on greed, competition etc., we will have Government that will represent us. This is an obviously simple fact. You need not read history to find this out. And if we do not lay emphasis on the right issue but are merely carried away by issues of secondary importance, how can we succeed? To lay emphasis on something that is of secondary importance rather than on the major issues is to

produce confusion and perhaps that is the interest of those who want to gain power.

So in order to bring about a happy state for man, that is, for you and me, and since we do not live by bread alone, we have to understand the psychological factors, the complexities that exist in each one of us; and we must free ourselves from such conditioning as greed for power. Without understanding all this, to organize for bread becomes impossible. So without transformation of the individual there will be no happiness for man and if you are not willing to change, then surely you have vested interests in religion, in property, in ideals and so on. Since you have vested interests and since you cannot be shaken, the extreme left winger says 'destroy them'. What is important in all this is, to take each problem as a whole, not as a part, and try to solve the problem. In part you can never find the solution but you can find the solution only by understanding the problem as a whole.

Question: Mahatma Gandhi and others believe that the time has come when men of goodwill, the just, the wise men should join together to organize to fight the present crisis. Are you not escaping from this duty as most of our spiritual leaders are doing?

Krishnamurti: It is obviously necessary that men of goodwill all over the world should come together. That goes without saying. But how can they come together. We want to do something fundamentally and also peacefully. Our function is to do something because we are good at heart. But individually the good at heart have also formulae. They want to act in a certain way and then we begin. Then we find we cannot get on. Men of goodwill should not have formulae. They should be above formulae and not be part of



any system. And that is where we find the difficulty. First of all I do not believe in leadership. I think the very idea of leading somebody is antisocial, anti-spiritual, and with that idea I wish to explain my position.

First of all, as I said during the talk, any action on the edge of the precipice will only create further confusion for the very reason that we are at the edge of the precipice, that we are confused. And action out of confusion cannot produce good results but will only further the confusion. So what we can do is to move away from the confusion, that is, the confusion within ourselves. And that is what I am doing; moving away from confusion, political, spiritual, psychological and helping those who want to withdraw from that confusion. But in order to understand the confusion they must look at it and it requires enormous thinking. Surely such a person is not an escapist. How can you act when you yourself are in confusion? How can you bring about clarity if you are blind and how can you lead anybody? When a man realizes that he is blind and confused he should first free himself from confusion and from those bondages which are binding and blinding him. To act without the clarification is to create further misery and the idea of following is really very important. The idea of having a leader should be really understood. We have been led, socially, economically, religiously by our leaders. You may ask negatively: but for them, what would have been our condition? Is it not an important question to ask? is it not the fact that we are being led which shows our incapacity to think for ourselves, to live rightly for ourselves. We depend on somebody to tell us how to act, how to think, in other words our system of upbringing is based on what to think and not how to

think and hence we need leaders. And I assure you the present chaos does not demand new leaders. It does demand something totally different, that is, for each individual to become a light to himself and not be dependent on somebody else. And that requires great effort and understanding on the part of each one of us. So, men of goodwill are many in the world. If you really come down to facts you and I are men of goodwill at moments. We want to live peacefully in the world. But so many influences and conditions have overpowered us and it is from these we have to free ourselves. That depends naturally on each one of us and not on somebody else. So, that means that men of goodwill must also be free from conditioning, from nationalistic and communalistic ideals. They must cease to be nationalistic. They must cease to think as Brahmins, Muslims, Christians and so on. They must have no definite formula. For that is what is preventing us from coming together. If you are a Hindu you want to express your goodwill within the framework of Hinduism and where will that lead you? The same applies to the Christian, the Mussalman and so on. And therefore we are back to the whole problem which is much more difficult than it appears superficially.

By all means men of goodwill should come together. But they do not unfortunately, because they all have the conditioning which society has imposed upon them and that is why I am saying that we should free ourselves from those conditionings and think in new terms. And it is for you to begin and not for the leader or the men of goodwill. It is you who have to live with your neighbour and not the leader.

So in all these questions what is important, it seems to me, is the

primary issue; we must not be confused with secondary problems. The primary issue is you and not somebody else. Because we have given ourselves over to the guru, to the political leader, to a theory, we have created in ourselves a state of confusion. Because one theory can be superseded by another theory and one leader can supersede another leader, we get confused. The intellectuals have failed. Their theories have also failed and if we depend on leaders we shall only plunge further into misery and drag humanity too with us. To resist the absurdities of leadership is extraordinarily difficult because we are lazy and because we hope somebody else will solve the problem. So it is important for us to realize the fact that not someone else but we are responsible for this misery and no leader can transform it. To understand this, requires extraordinary effort but we waste our energies in such absurd ways that we cannot tackle the problem fully and completely.

Question: Young men have said to me again and again: We are frustrated, we do not know what we are to do in the present crisis. Our leaders are unable to lead us as they are themselves confused. We expected so much from political independence and from the settlement with the Muslim league.

Krishnamurti: There are so many questions involved in this question. So one has to take them one by one. First of all: 'we are frustrated'. You know the meaning of frustration. You want something and you cannot get it and you feel lost and you feel that you have been prevented from getting it. You want to get a job and cannot get it and you feel frustrated. You want to marry a woman and you cannot do that and you feel frustrated, prevented or held back. I want to have power and position and I am thwarted and I

feel lost, and a wall has arisen between me and that which I want to gain.

Before you say that you feel frustrated you must find out if ever you are in a position when you are not frustrated. As it is, you get all you want, yet you want something more. So there is constant frustration. It is constant because of emptiness, because you feel empty, economically, psychologically and spiritually empty. You think you can fill that emptiness by getting what you want. But if you examine very closely you will find that you can never fill that emptiness. We have tried to, by much study, by science, through various means of destruction, by pursuing gurus. But as you cannot fill that void you feel frustrated. That is a psychological fact.

Now what is this emptiness? Have you ever examined it? To understand it you must cease trying to fill it. It is like a man filling a bucket with a hole in it. It is always leaking and it can never be filled and you will say that such a man is unbalanced.

In this problem itself is the answer and not away from it. So, if we understood the process of frustration and its implications, the questions could be answered comparatively simply.

Our leaders are unable to lead us; we expected so much from political independence, and from the settlement with the Muslim League. We come back to the same problem. Who creates the leader? You create him, because you want somebody to tell you what to do. Because we are too lazy to think out what we want, and always like to be told by another. Psychologically he becomes your master and because you are confused he is also confused. So out of our confusion we project. When the leader is confused we blame him. We do not blame ourselves but only blame somebody else.

We expected so much from the settlement with the Muslim League. Do you mean to say that through separation you can find any solution? You may get better jobs. it is like this. Once you allow war, which is the major evil, minor evils will follow. Once you admit division between peoples, between groups, between Brahmins and the rest, you create further confusion, and a settlement based on divisions of people is no solution at all. This has been proved over and over again through history, and still we are doing it.

So when you look at all these problems of distribution of food, of men of goodwill and of frustration, you will see that they are all closely interrelated. We have not seen the interrelationship, because we have tried to solve each problem separately on its own level. The only solution to conflict and confusion is after all Truth which liberates. To let Reality or Truth come to you, you have to be free from bondages. Not only from the subtle bondages and the obvious ones, but also from nationalism, communalism etc. If we work at this we will bring about clarity in ourselves.

October 22 1947

## **MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 26TH OCTOBER, 1947**

We have got a very difficult subject in understanding ourselves. As we have got a very difficult subject to deal with it requires a great deal of patience and we must not jump to conclusions. It requires a great deal of study and patient understanding, a careful analysis and a sense of detachment, which is not intellectual detachment, but actual observation. So, if you are willing we will undertake this journey together to understand this problem of life and while on that journey let us discover together. My interest would be to think together. But as there are many here, it is impossible to exchange ideas, to discuss them, but I will try in these coming talks every Sunday to answer as many questions as possible so that I do not leave one stone unturned, and by that means, you and I can see this whole complex problem which we call life. So, in making this journey let us not condemn or come to any definite conclusion, which you will towards the end, but not yet.

Because we are too close to the problem, we do not know yet how to observe. Because we are too close to the problems such as poverty, the war that is coming, etc., we are incapable of real observation, and real study and understanding. So let us not jump to conclusions. I am only going to paint a picture, which though I paint it, is also yours, because you are dealing with life, the life which is in Europe, in Russia, in Japan, in chaotic China or in the somewhat orderly America. We deal with the whole of it and if we are to deal with it sanely, there must be no conclusion as the moment we conclude we put a stop to thinking.

I am not here to give you ideas but on the contrary, I am here to discuss together with you if we can, seriously and earnestly the problem of living. We are too much accustomed to listening to leaders and to discussions, and therefore it is unfortunate that it is difficult for us to discuss without jumping to conclusions or trying to find out what are the inner motives of the speaker. I have no inner motive but I want to state something which is yours, not mine, and I want to describe something which is true.

As life is not merely one phase, let us not at any time approach it through any exclusive path, either the intellectual, or the emotional. Because by emphasizing one phase or one path, we will not have the whole picture, and you and I are trying to understand the whole picture. If we have a canvas in front of us with a picture, if we merely study one corner of it, surely we will miss the whole picture. If you are an economist and view life from the economic point of view you will miss the whole picture. The same is true if you are a socialist or a communist or a capitalist, etc. So even though you are specialized in philosophy, economy or law, etc., put them aside for the moment at least because in that problem and not merely in a part of it lies the solution. The more we specialize the more we are going to destroy ourselves. It is a biological fact. Animals that have specialized have perished. So, similarly, as our problem is not a specialized problem let us look at it from every point of view. There are only very few who can look at the canvas and get the whole significance of the picture and it is they who are the real saviours and not the specialists.

As I was saying, life is a very complex problem and a very complex problem must naturally be approached very simply. Take

for example a child which is a very complex entity; yet to understand a child our mind should be very simple. If you see a beautiful picture or a lovely sunset if you are comparing them with other pictures or sunsets, you won't understand the picture or the sunset. Similarly life is very complex and it involves actual thinking, feeling, earning one's livelihood, relationship, search for truth, etc. So to understand life we must have an extraordinarily simple mind, not an innocent one, a very simple mind that sees directly everything as it is and not translated according to what it wants. This is one of our difficulties: to approach the complex problem of life simply. To understand and to approach simply, we have naturally to ask ourselves this question: what is our relationship to this problem, this chaos and this degradation that we see about us, where man is against man, ideas against another set of ideas, where despair is prevailing? Perhaps you do not know about this despair. In Europe they feel it vitally because they see how everything has failed: education, religion, one system after another has collapsed.

So, how do you regard this chaos, this frightful confusion? How would you set about to bring order out of this chaos? Where would you begin? Obviously with yourselves because your relationship with the chaos is direct. Let us not blame a few insane leaders. Because you and I have created this chaos, to bring order we must begin with our house, with ourselves. We are not to begin with a system; we are not to begin with an idea; we are not to begin with a revolution; we are not to begin with a theory; we must begin with ourselves, because we are responsible for ourselves. Without us there is no world and so we are the world and we are the problem,



which is not an intellectual theory but a fact. So do not rush to put it aside, which is usually one of our escapes, one of our clever means of getting out of it. Because when we deal with it so directly, what we feel and what we do is of vital significance and because we are unwilling to face it we say 'get on'.

As it is an irrefutable fact that we are the world and we have created the mess, it is through us alone that the salvation lies and not through something else and that is the basis of what I am going to say about the whole problem. Because the problem is not external to you; to understand it you have to understand yourself. Though it sounds very simple it is extremely complex. If everyone in the world would observe decently and kindly without condemnation and exploitation, there would be peace in the world. So the problem is your responsibility, a responsibility you have shirked; the moment you recognize that you are in the mess you have to act positively and vigorously but we do not want to act positively, therefore we look to a leader and to a system. So in my talks and discussions the only starting point and the only essential point is you.

For several reasons we have overshadowed our responsibility, it has been put away, discharged, hidden, dispelled or submerged. This chaos is the result of systems whether the capitalistic, the socialistic, the communistic or the brahminic. That is, we have systems and formulae and they are more important to us than the individual. If we will observe still further we will find that organized society, in which we include education, religion, etc., has smothered our individual responsibility. You believe and your belief is merely a condition imposed upon you because it gratifies

you and gives you security in society, factually, psychologically and abstractively. So, when you believe, your individual responsibility is taken away and you are working just like a machine. When society becomes more important the importance of bureaucracy becomes overwhelming. Take the example of a political party. When you join it you become a party-machine. You want to dominate, you want to put your ideas through. So the party, the organization, the system become much more important than you and yet you do not realize it.

Again take the case of education. I do not know why we are educated. What does it all mean? What is the purpose of education? You become lawyers, mathematicians, chemical engineers and so on. You are educated to be something and therefore you cease to be the individual who is responsible, but you are specialized. The more we are educated the more conditioned we are. The more we read the more we repeat. "Teach the people how to read and then we will have no revolution" is a famous saying. With education we have the regimentation through the Army, the Navy, the Police, etc. So these are the many factors which make us unconscious of our responsibility. We all function as machines because as we are members of a party or group, we have no responsibility.

So in order to transform this chaos and darkness we have to start with ourselves and not with the machine, because, psychologically you are always the master of the machine or the system. So we shall start from this point: you are the only person that matters and not the society because your relationship with one another is the society. What you think, what you feel, what you do

is of the utmost importance because you create the society and the environment.

I will now answer some of the questions sent to me.

I do not prepare beforehand the answers to these questions. Generally I do not even like to look at them in advance as I wish to answer directly and so I am not choosing what I want to answer. The question will receive the right answer if the questioner is serious in his intentions. If you merely ask an intellectual question to trap me you may trap me but you will lose out. But if you ask really seriously, you will find that there is a serious answer.

Question: What is the kind of thinking needed today to live in peace? At the same time could you show a way by which millions of unemployed people can lead a life without starvation.

Krishnamurti: To have peace you must live peacefully. Property is one of the causes of contention. To own things, whether through control of property by which you gain more and more or through relationship with ideas, will create contention. So if you want peace you must live without greed, because greed leads to nationalism and it is a factor which divides people. From greed we come to envy and a desire to possess. All these create competition between man and man. Organized religion is also one of the factors that separate man from man for we say we are Christians, Hindus, etc. You believe and I do not believe and therefore there is contention. You want to convert me and I think my religion is much better than yours, nearer the supreme. So to have peace in the world, which is very essential now, we must be peaceful. You cannot have peace through communalism. You cannot have peace through intelligence whether it is the intelligence of the Brahmin or

of one of another caste or of the American or of the German. To have peace in the world we must cease to be greedy. To have peace in the world we must cease to be a Brahmin, a Hindu, a Muslim or an Englishman and so on. All the divisions have to be dropped because you and I are one biologically. When this is done we can feed the starving millions. If not, we will be wrangling to find out which is the better system, or the best set of ideas. So the starving man is left out. This does not mean that we should not organize to feed the many, the one. One has to think in terms of the world. The scientist can be put to work to feed, clothe and provide shelter for everybody. But scientists are also nationalists like you and me. If you are spreading this poison of separatism you are also contributing to this disaster. Separatism not only economically but psychologically as well; the organized separatism of religion or societies, etc. If you really felt that they are wrong, would you not stop them and thereby bring about a different world tomorrow? Nobody is worried about what is going to happen five hundred years hence. I want to be fed tomorrow, immediately and you could provide food, clothing and shelter if we all acted immediately. But unfortunately the crisis is far away from most of us or at least we think it is far away and therefore we are not faced with it. Nobody is going to give you peace, certainly not God, because we are not worthy of it. We have made this mess and we have to get out of it and we cannot get out of it through any system.

Question: More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of. Mahatma Gandhi has wonderfully exemplified its efficacy in his daily life. If individuals without distraction and materialistic aggrandizement lift their hearts to God in penitent

prayer, then the mercy of God will dispel the catastrophe that has overtaken the world. Is this not the right attitude to develop?

Krishnamurti: We must differentiate between prayer and meditation. What do we mean by prayer? Generally it means supplication or petition. You demand, beg, or ask from what you call God, something which you want. To put it plainly it means that you are in need and you pray. You are in suffering and you pray. You are mentally confused and you pray. That is, you petition or you supplicate somebody to tell you what to do. To whom are you praying? You say to God. But surely God or Truth is something unknown and which cannot be formulated. If you say I know God it is no longer God. God and Truth are not created. It must come to you and you cannot go to it and ask. When you ask you are creating it and therefore it ceases to be God or Truth. So before you ask, you must know whether you want peace from God, that is, Truth. When you yourself create this chaos in this world you look to another for help. So God cannot give you peace, because it is your fabrication. What is the good of praying? Is not then prayer an escape? Please do not bring personalities into it. Let us think about it directly. It does not matter who prays. Once a person in America came to see me and he said that he had prayed to God to give him a refrigerator and he said that he had the refrigerator. But you pay for it in the end. If you want peace you will have it, but it will not be peace, it will only be decay, stagnation and regimentation. Peace is something very dynamic which is creative and you cannot have something creative through supplication. But prayer is completely different from meditation. A man who prays can never understand what is meditation, because he is concerned with gain. Meditation

is a process of understanding. Understanding is not a result and it is not something you gain. It is a process of self-discovery. That means meditation is an awareness of your whole process of living. Meditation is a process of understanding, the process of your whole being, not only a part of it, and that means that you have to be aware of everything that you are doing. it is not concentration. You take a picture and you focus your attention on that. That is comparatively easy. That is exclusive, you exclude all thoughts and you focus your attention on one point. Surely that is not meditation. Meditation is an awareness constantly becoming deeper and deeper as a result of clearly seeing through the many layers of consciousness. It is like a pool that is still when the process is over. When the problem ceases through awareness the solution becomes stillness. It cannot be made quiet. So prayer, concentration, meditation, are entirely different things and he who prays can never know what meditation is; neither he who concentrates can ever know what meditation is. For meditation is spontaneous and therefore it requires spontaneity and not a regimented mind. Spontaneity comes into being when there is awareness, awareness in which there is no condemnation, no judgment and no identification. If you go deeper and deeper and let it flow freely it becomes meditation, in which the thinker is the thought and there is no division between the thinker and the thought.

Question: You deride the Brahmins. Have they not played an important part in the culture of India.

Krishnamurti: Perhaps they have. But what of it? Surely such a question indicates hereditary pride. Does it not? It is like saying

that I was something marvellous in my past incarnation but now I am a boot-black. This idea that you are the exclusive race of Brahmins, this idea that you have a master-creed which cannot be handed down, is detrimental to society. So what matters is not whether you are a Brahmin or not, but what you are now, not what you were in the past. Originally every society in the world had a group of people who were devoted to something real. You call them Brahmins, somebody else calls them Hebrews, Christians, and so on. But what they were essentially concerned with was the pursuit of the real, irrespective of what the society around was doing. By what name they are called does not matter. It is they who gave to society, culture, and not the people who were embroiled in society whether politicians, lawyers or warmongers. These do not make society, they do not make culture, but the people who really preach culture are those who are peaceful and not the politicians. So in the past there were such people who were not concerned with ambition, with power, with position, with property, with systems. Not only here but right through the world. There were few who were not concerned, here, and in China there were large groups, and practically everywhere throughout history. And here now, what has happened to the hereditary Brahmins, who are supposed to guide society, to help man to think rightly? They have become merchants, they have become lawyers, they have become politicians. Do you think culture can exist on that kind of basis? On a structure that is really destructive to men?

So, what matters is, not the past, but the result of the past which is the present. To understand the past you have to look through the present, psychologically and factually. The present is the passage

of the past to the future. If you do not change in the present, the future will be biased, which means chaos. So we are concerned with the present, not with the Brahmins of old times who were concerned with something far greater than merely grabbing for money, for position, and coding up systems. So since the present is of the highest importance, what are we doing? In what way are we changing ourselves and guiding culture, not Indian culture or Christian culture, but human culture. It is only by setting up peaceful thinking in daily life that we can realize Truth. There is a responsibility for those who are not themselves immediately concerned with food, clothing, and shelter. It is your responsibility to ensure food and clothing for the naked and the starving; instead you are intellectually indulging in verbiage. You must completely shed your opinions and that means revolution in your mind.

Question: You have attained illumination, but what about us, the millions?

Krishnamurti: So, what about you? You and I are the millions, but are we aware of it? The moment we are in despair, we are confused, but who can save us, not the illumined, I assure you, not the leader, not the church, not the temple, not the politician. You are the only person who can save yourself and none other. It is like a man who is in sorrow. If he is unaware of his sorrow, he goes to another and talks about saving the world. If he is aware of his sorrow, of his constant loneliness, emptiness, strife, pains, struggle, then he begins with himself, and he is not concerned about who is illumined, and who is not illumined. He is concerned with his own transformation, with his own regeneration, and that is what matters, not the leader, not the follower, but you; because you yourself are



the mass, the life; and life is painful and you feel anxious when you do not understand it, but you can understand it only through yourself, and not through another.

October 26, 1947

## **MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 2ND NOVEMBER, 1947**

I would like to continue from where I left off last Sunday. Perhaps those of you who have followed the discussions, those who have followed what I have been saying seriously, will remember that I was trying to show the relationship between the individual and society. How society having been created by the individual smothers the individual through systems, through organizations, through religion and so on. I would like to continue from where I left off because I think it is very important to realize not only verbally but really very seriously and profoundly, the relationship between the individual and society, as well as the transformation of society and the regeneration of the individual. There is hope in man, not in society, not in systems, organized religious systems, but in you, and in me. I think this is fairly obvious. We must try to know what is happening in the world and not merely accept a formula, a system because there is no hope in them. So it is very important to realize the relationship between the individual and society. Is not society the result of one individual's relationship with another? Your relationship with another creates the society which in turn brings into being the State. The State by itself is not a separate entity. It is the outcome of your relationship with others. So it is from society that State comes into being.

Though you assert that relationship is based on brotherhood, love and religious ideas and so on, if you really analyze it very carefully and deeply you will see that it is based on sensate values, that is, the relationship is the product of sensory values, values

made either by the hand or by the mind. Sensory values are not eternal values. That we shall discuss presently. So the relationship based on sensory values has produced in the world, wars, catastrophes, the chaos which you see throughout the world. This relationship between you and another has bred individual enterprise, and opposed to that there has come into being collective action. If you examine both, you will see that society is based on sensory values; whether of the right or of the left it is ultimately based on sensory values; and neither the right nor the left has brought happiness to man. That is, whether it is organized society of the left or of the right, man's happiness has not come into being.

Man is in despair, confused and in sorrow. So the problem is this, does man's happiness - thought, action, mind - does it lie in sensate values upon which our society, either of the left or of the right is based? Though the right produces religion, worship, etc., yet if you look at it very deeply, you will see that ultimately it denies man's happiness because it produces wars, regimentation and an education that merely shows you what to think, not how to think; yet surely the organized society of the left also denies man's happiness because it is regimented. So, does man's happiness, the happiness which is yours and mine, does it lie in things made by the hand and by the mind? And this is what we are all going to discover, through self-knowledge; it is you, and not somebody else who is going to tell you where your happiness lies. Your creative being, creative activity and your joys and your happiness are in sensory values. Through self-knowledge we can discover what is the truth and right happiness and whether our happiness lies in things made by the hand and by the mind.

Now, what is self-knowledge? Surely it cannot be learned through books. Surely it is not the assertion of another. You have to know the total process of your whole being, that is, to be aware of everything that you are - thoughts, feeling and action. Being aware, not by becoming aware, of what you are, that is the very beginning of self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge I do not see how there can be any thinking at all. Since you are the world and your relationship with another is society, without a revolutionary change in you there can be no hope. How to understand yourself is of primary importance. "Transform society" is one of our catch-phrases, an easy assertion, that we must do something about the world as though the world were so different from ourselves. We have created this horror, these wars, this mad chaos in the world at the present time and we cannot transform it if we do not know how to think about the problem. We cannot think about the problem unless we are aware of it. And you cannot be aware of it outside of yourself. You have created this, therefore you should become aware of yourselves and not of others. Therefore the confusion has to be cleared within your mind, which does not mean you must wait till all the confusion in yourself is cleared before you act.

So the problem of which we are well aware is how to transform the world, to bring happiness, to bring order, to bring peace. It must begin with us, that is with you and me, not merely by saying 'I must begin', but in action, by becoming aware of what we are doing, of all the process and the repetition of ideas, and the absurdities in which we sometimes indulge, our class and communal divisions, national and racial divisions. All that has to be altered, has it not, before there can be fundamental changes in

the world? And I do not think we realize what an extraordinary crisis this is. As I have said in my previous talks, it is not an ordinary economic crisis but an extraordinary crisis. A crisis like this happens only very rarely and we are all confronted with one of the rarest of catastrophes and confusions. And we all are approaching it with formulae, with systems, which is only blind thinking, whether the system is of the right or of the left. What we need is a complete revolution in thought, that is, in values and you cannot create values except by awakening the individual, not the individual in opposition to the mass. And as the individual's awakening is limited by narrow prejudicial activities, he cannot transform or regenerate himself, that is, the mass, and that can only be done by becoming aware of yourself, of whatever you do from the least important to the most profound. If you are not aware you must find out why you are not aware. When you walk down the streets you are aware of the poverty of the people, of the ill-fed families and of the utter callousness of everyone. But we have created this, you and I have created what is about us. It has not come into being by some mysterious charm, and since we are not aware of it how can we transform it? Surely that is the obvious beginning. Is it not? It looks simple and yet the most profound beginning is to begin with ourselves, which is the most difficult. We can always reform others, but it is very difficult to transform ourselves. (Laughter).

I know, Sirs, you laugh and that laughter has very little significance, it does not mean very much. I know that to most of us life has very little significance. We are all trying to solve the world's problem. What is happening in the Punjab, has happened in

Germany. What is happening is a slow process of regimentation, even in England which has stood for the liberty of the individual. We are not aware of what is happening in America and China. You read about all of this because unfortunately it is one of our pet habits to read papers. We have become so dull and I think that is where our difficulty lies. We must revivify and quicken our whole sensitivity but you cannot be sensitive by merely saying that you must be sensitive. You become sensitive, when you become aware of yourself in action, in thought and in feeling. Surely hope or God, or whatever name you like to give it is to be found not in religion, not in systems but in trying to discover truth in every little thing. Truth is not far away but very near, only if we knew how to look for it, but we do not look for it because we are not aware. So what is of primary importance is to be aware, so choicelessly, so penetratingly aware of every thought, every feeling that is revealed.

Question: In a recent article by a famous correspondent it was stated that wisdom and personal example do not solve the world's problem. What do you say?

Krishnamurti: As there are many things involved in this particular question we must analyse it carefully. First of all we are persuaded or told what to think by famous correspondents, because correspondents, like you, have axes to grind. So, being very clever and good at words the correspondent writes and we read because we are educated, and what we read becomes the truth. We have stopped thinking but we absorb and so, famous correspondents become very important in our daily activities, also what they think and what they do. First of all we should be aware of everything;

one has to be extremely alert, not to absorb other people's ideas and demands. The correspondent says that wisdom and personal examples are not enough to solve the world's problem. Neither do I think wisdom and personal example will save the world. The correspondent asks invariably for political action either of the left or of the right, based on a certain set of ideals, religious, economic or social.

Now, what does personal example mean? invariably it leads to imitation. You have an ideal and you conform to it and naturally conformity, imitation, regimentation of thought can never solve the world's problems. Therefore personal example in a great crisis becomes of very little significance. Wisdom cannot be realized through personal example. Wisdom is a thing that is living, real and constantly moving. It is not in a fixed place; it is not learned through books. What is necessary at the present time is not example, but revolution in thinking, creative thinking. And that revolution cannot take place or be gained by following a few leaders. It can only be gained through you, the individual. So neither personal example, nor political action based on a system or on an authority is going to save the world. That has been tried over and over again. Man puts his faith in a system, in the party, in a leader and each one of these has invariably failed. We merely returned to the exploitation of man in a different form, in different degrees, on a different level. Whether the State exploits man or man exploits man is all the same. The problem is not solved by the State or by examples.

The problem is our problem, because we no longer think creatively, but are following patterns, in a regimented way. We

have brought about this world chaos and therefore personal example can never save mankind.

So there must be a creative revolution in thinking and that is extremely difficult. And because it is difficult we look to somebody else, to the example, to the leader. What do I mean by creative thinking? Do we think at all or do we merely respond to a certain set of conditions? Is that thinking? Because you are a Hindu, you are conditioned in a certain manner or if a Muslim, a Buddhist, or what ever it be, your response is to that particular conditioning. Surely that is not thinking. You have a certain conditioning and you respond to that. You think that you are thinking. There can be revolution in thinking only when the man is free from conditioning, not only the conscious conditioning, but the many layers of consciousness in which conditioning exists and to become liberated from that conditioning is revolutionary thinking. And that means you have to cease to be a Brahmin or a Muslim or a Hindu or a Christian. You have to transcend all fallacies, class divisions and that is the problem now. I know you will easily agree with me in all this. You will shake your head in assent. You will probably come next Sunday and the many following Sundays and yet you will go on in the same routine because you are conditioned. If you do change, what will your neighbours say! You might even lose your job and therefore you will go on shaking your head and the world will go on more and more miserably and you will go on talking about changing the world.

So the start is not in the world of which you are unaware, but in you. The world's problem can be solved if you are aware of the



catastrophe and the misery in yourself, the confusion which exists in you and therefore in the world. Political action is comparatively easy. To organize the distribution of food for mankind is comparatively easy. There is a need to clothe man, shelter him and give him food. We all know that. Every school boy knows it. But what is the result? It is merely book knowledge. Because the boy is conditioned, because he cannot free himself from his conditioning, it remains merely book knowledge without action. That is why, we must break through our conditioning and all the degradations, the degenerative qualities that exist. I assure you that is the only way out, and that also means that personal examples are of very little significance in a world crisis of this kind, but what is of the highest importance is what you are, your thinking, your feeling, your action now.

Question: What do you mean when you say that we use the present as a passage.

Krishnamurti: Last Sunday I said that we use the present as a passage to the future. We use the present as a means of achieving some result, whether it is a psychological result or a personal result, changing oneself to become something. We use the present as a means of the past for the future, that is, to answer the question, the present is the result of the past. Surely that is obvious. What you think is based on the past, your being is founded on the past. Now thought without understanding the past, goes through the present into the future. So the future is the past continuing through the present, and it is the result of the past, it can only be understood through the present. The psycho - analysts look to the past to find difficulties, the conditioning, the complex, and so on. But to

understand the past, the present which is the past must be understood. That is, through the present is the past. Past is not unrelated to the present. So to understand the past the door is the present, which is also the door to the future. That is, to understand the significance of the past the present must be understood and not sacrificed for the future. There are political groups of the left and also of the right who say: "Sacrifice the present for the future. It does not matter what happens to man in the present but we will lead him to a marvellous future." As though they knew what the future is going to be! This idea of sacrificing the present for the future has thus led man to disaster, to chaos and misery. Religious people also use the present as a passage to the future. That is, you say: "In my next incarnation I will do something, but nothing now. Give me a chance." That is sacrificing the present, surely. Surely eternity is the present, the timeless is now and to understand the timeless you cannot approach it through time. Yet, you are using time, that is, the past, the present and the future as a means of realizing the immeasurable, the timeless. So one must be aware of what this political fallacy of sacrificing the present for the future is, and one must be aware also of this idea that the future is different from the present.

If you do not change now you will never change. Because you are continuing the present, understanding, wisdom is in the present not in the future. Wisdom is being, which is the present, which is now, and the present can be understood when the mind understands the past and thus becomes psychologically aware of the whole content of our being now, of what you are now and therefore to understand the now, you must look to the past, because your

thought is based on the past. Surely that is obvious, is it not? You cannot think without the past and to understand the past, examine what you are now, be aware of what you are now and becoming aware of what you are now, you will see we are using the present as a passage to get somewhere, interpreting the present and knowing its significance conditioned by the past. So if you use time as a means to the timeless you will never find the timeless because the means creates the end. If you use wrong means you will produce the wrong end. War is a wrong means to peace and while we are talking of peace, nations are preparing for war. The means is the end and the end is not dissociated from the means. So if you would understand the timeless, what is bound in time, that is, the past, the present and the future, must free itself and that is extremely arduous. It demands constant awareness of every thought and every feeling and becoming aware how it is conditioned, how it is caught up in us.

Question: The communists say that the rulers of Indian states, the zamindars and the capitalists are the chief exploiters of the nation and they should be liquidated in order to secure food, clothing and shelter for all. Mahatma Gandhi says that the rulers, zamindars and the capitalists are the trustees of the persons under their control and influence and therefore they may be allowed to remain and function. What do you say?

Krishnamurti: It is extremely confusing, what is happening in the world. We give more importance to what other people say, and do not mind what we think. It is really odd. Wherever you go, in America, in England, and even in Damascus and here, you are fully acquainted with what everyone is saying, and yet do you know

what you think? You will repeat what this political leader, that philosopher says, but will that save mankind? What another thinks, has it any significance? So the capitalists, the leaders and others say one thing contradicting or occasionally agreeing. So it is what they think that matters but not what you and I think? Do let us find out what we think apart from all our leaders, apart from our gurus, apart from all our systems and philosophies or all our groups whether of the left or of the right, let us think of the problem as though we are facing it for the first time. Let us view it as though we had never read a book. Surely that is the only way to solve the problem. So we are not discussing what the experts, the authorities, the leaders think but what you and I think.

How will you get rid of the zamindars and capitalists? How does one become a zamindar or a maharajah? By exploiting people. To gather more than what one needs, leads to exploitation. Does it not? Merely because you need a certain amount of food, clothing and shelter is no reason for becoming the means by which some men use others for their personal satisfaction either economically, socially, or psychologically. Therefore to use man to gain power, position and authority becomes exploitation. So exploitation is the problem and not the zamindars. They are like you. If you had the chance you would be zamindars. If you had the chance you would be capitalists. Because you have something, you want more. You lose your generosity, the moment you climb up the ladder. So the problem is exploitation; to stop it, is the problem, is it not? And the capitalists, zamindars, etc., are trustees! Good God, they are trustees! Do you know what 'trustees' means? Trust means love, and trustees, people who love man. To seek position

for oneself, does it mean love for man? How can you love and at the same time exploit people? See, please, I am not taking sides. So do not become aggressive. The problem is much more profound than merely to say that they are trustees or not. First of all the problem is how easily you are persuaded. Let us think it out together now. The problem is exploitation, can exploitation cease while there is individual enterprise or must there be collective action? We know what individual enterprise has brought into the world and we also know what State exploitation can do. Both are equally ruthless and brutal; the latter perhaps more so, because there is no appeal and the State is run by the few. They also seek power and position. They also exploit man. Perhaps they may organize collective food, clothing and shelter for everybody. But they will exploit something which is much more important, your mind, your being, which means what you are thinking. Surely that is also exploitation, to control what you say and think. So exploitation is a very complex problem and as I said the moment we stock beyond what is essential, we exploit not only physiologically, but, psychologically also. The more clothes, the more shelter, the more ideas, you are acquiring, the greater the exploitation. Let us analyse it. The moment you acquire, the moment you become important, the moment the emphasis is laid on you as an entity acquiring, there must be exploitation, which does not mean that we should not organize for the welfare of the whole. But if the organizer is concerned with acquisition, then surely organizing is a means of exploitation, which we have seen happen over and over again.

Can man live in relationship with another without acquisition,

without position? Surely that is the problem put in a different way. Can we live in a society without acquiring more and more property for property represents power, position and security and you are not willing to limit your needs? Individual enterprise and other causes have contributed to horrors, so people of the left say: liquidate. But liquidation is not the solution surely. Man may not exploit through means of production, but the State will. The means of securing food, clothing and shelter is denied by psychological acquisitions which again is seen in everyday life. But this desire for acquisition is a means of security. The more you have the safer you are, at least you think you are. But is there such a thing as security? Because we have sought security irrespective of anything we possess, we have created this chaos. Each person is seeking security and because each person wants to be more secure still, another group says we must have collective security. That means exploiting man not merely for physical security, but exploiting man for much more profound things.

So we come back to the question whether acquisition, psychological or physical, can be voluntarily relinquished. If you do not voluntarily relinquish it, it will be taken out of your hands, that is, if you do not physically or psychologically relinquish the desire to acquire, society is going to deprive you of everything and you will be made into a tool. That is what is happening. Society now is based on industry and therefore the labour must be organized and also controlled, that is you and I will be controlled. Therefore the state will control you and tell you what you should do and should not do. This is coming whether you like it or not. And if you really relinquish this desire to possess, to acquire, then

morally, we will create a new society not based on any compulsion but that requires a great deal of active intelligence. It also means that you must begin with yourselves but since you are apathetic, lazy, you will be directed and compelled and there is no solution in that way. The solution lies in understanding what exploitation is, not only physical exploitation but the psychological as well and if one does not understand psychological exploitation, one fails to realize that the more we desire security, position, the nearer we are to loneliness, to poverty, to degradation. This is an immense question and an immense problem. It is to be understood very deeply because we do not lay emphasis on sensate value only.

We live for intangible things like power. This greed for power comes because we do not understand ourselves. To understand ourselves requires a great deal of work, a great deal of thought and patience, the patience to look at things as they are.

Question: Are your teachings intended only for the sannyasis or for all of us with families and their responsibilities?

Krishnamurti: Surely what I am saying is meant for all: for those who have renounced the world and for those who live in the world, for he who has renounced is still in the world because he is in the world of his own making, just as the worldly person is in the world of his own desires.

Both are held in bondage whether the bondage of the family, of the sensate or the bondage of the mind, and what I am saying applies to both because freedom is not one's creation. God or truth does not lie either in things made by the hand or in the things made by the mind. One has to transcend them, go above and beyond the passions, the envies, the greed, the ill will, the worldliness and

beyond the things that man invents and creates. Then only shall we find what is truth. And we do find it at rare moments, moments when the mind is not thinking of itself, when the mind is tranquil. This happens very rarely. When you are unconsciously wandering in the streets, when you are not thinking, spontaneously there is this extraordinary state in feeling - a fleeting revelation uninvited, unexpressed but which if you once have experienced it you want to regain. Therefore you are caught again in memory, in want.

After all the man who has a family is in a terrible position, is he not? Look at yourselves. Because of confusion in the world and sadness and despair in the world you are concerned with what is going to happen to your children. You want them to be secure, safely married and settled. The greater the confusion, the more you want security. That is, you want to push your responsibility on to somebody else, and what happens? You are unwilling to face the real issues, you call it responsibilities, whether it be love or any other thing. Likewise the man who has renounced the world is caught up in the images of his own mind. For him it is not different because he is heavy with his own fancies, his own dreams made of his own creation. He is born with them as you are with yours and so what is the real issue? How to live in the world when greed, when envy, when ill will, when those passions that destroy men are rampant. Surely we can live in the world without greed. Yes sir, you may laugh, you can live in the world without greed. To live so, you require a great deal of alertness, a great deal of thought, not to follow leaders, but to become aware of yourself. Then the family has a different significance because love comes in. Without love, family has no meaning and most of us, if I may say so, have not



loved when we have families. If we understood our relationship with another real transformation would come. Then there would be love which will bring into being regeneration and a new world.

Question: You may have heard of the awful tragedy that has taken place and is even now taking place in the Punjab. Will the individual action based on right thinking and self-knowledge by the few who are capable of such action be significant to solve this Punjab problem?

Krishnamurti: What has happened in Punjab has also happened in Germany, in Europe. It has happened all over the world. It is not a peculiar Indian problem. This tragedy has taken place because of our national and religious bigotry. We are Hindus or we are Muslims, we are not human beings. We are labels, whether Germans or English, Japanese or Chinese and that is why the tragedy has taken place. I am afraid this is going to take place all over the world because nationalistic spirit is still rampant. Surely, till that ceases you are going to have war, economic, religious, psychological and all the rest of it. So the problem is not peculiar to Punjab but it is general. You only understand it by making it particular, by making it local. You are responsible for it and you have to transform yourselves. Because you have insisted for centuries on being either a Hindu or a Muslim as though what you call yourself mattered very much. We are labelled and we are unable to understand the sensitivity of other human beings and we are slaves to nationalism, to property and therefore we are willing to kill another in the name of freedom, in the name of God. To make it direct you have to change. Have you not? You have to completely stop nationalism. We have to stop the waving of the

flag. We have to cease to be a Hindu or a Mussalman or a German or an American and cease to think in those terms and think in different categories. I know you will agree with me, yet you will go home and still be a Hindu or a Christian and God knows what else. You will continue your pujas, your Brahmanic tradition, you will go to the temples and function along the same routine. Yet we talk of brotherliness, being Hindus, and the tradition says that you must love each other as brothers. So what matters is that you should break up your conditioning. Not here, you have to break it up at home, at your political meetings. And then you will find how extraordinarily difficult it is. Your mothers, your sisters will cry and to please them you will have to become a hypocrite. You do not know how serious it is. You may be insensitive to it and you do not know what is happening? Preparations are going on for the third catastrophe which will be worse than ever before, and here we are discussing whether we are Brahmins or not. Is it not too childish? When you will be in a crisis will you bother about what caste you are, what nationality you are, whether you belong to the left or to the right? When we do, we are not aware of the crisis. We are controlled by our labels and that is our difficulty. To reawaken ourselves we have to become sensitive to the whole issue.

Question: You say discipline is opposed to freedom. But is not discipline necessary for freedom?

Krishnamurti: As this is a difficult problem, we have to consider thoroughly the implications of this question. A wrong means will produce a wrong end. Therefore right means must be employed for right ends. If you are disciplined, regimented, you will not produce freedom but a regimentation, a disciplined conditioning. It is

obvious, is it not? So the means matters much more than the end. So, if you discipline your mind according to a pattern, which is the means, then you are bound to produce an end which is patterned after the means. But you will say: I must organize my daily life otherwise I can do nothing. I must condition myself to do my daily duties. I must organize the day. Now, what do you organize for? Why do you discipline yourself at all? To get things done, is it not? That is, you arrange your day to achieve a certain result. That is one kind of discipline. You arrange it mechanically, discipline yourself mechanically to achieve a certain result. Now the same mentality is carried over. In order to achieve a result you discipline yourself more and more. You say, you must be happy, you must find God, you must know, and you employ methods in order to achieve that result. You think happiness is truth or God, that it is an end to be achieved. That it is fixed, as though happiness were fixed, something to be done mechanically, something to be gained and you say after establishing it you have the means to discipline yourself. Now, can a disciplined mind, in the sense I am using the word 'disciplined', be regimented, compelled through a means to an end? The means creates the end. The end is made by you. Therefore you are conditioning the end. Can a mind which is disciplined understand freedom? For a political man you may have to discipline yourself in order to achieve a result and in that process your mind becomes dull. Because party discipline is important, you sacrifice individual thinking in order to achieve a result. So you train yourself to be disciplined in order to achieve a result. There is no real thinking but the mind is merely hitched to a van you call the political machine and you cease to be a thinker and you are

disciplined to function effectively. What you say is: I will discipline, control myself according to a pattern, in order to be free. How absurd it sounds? To put it differently, need you go through drunkenness to become sober? As means is the end, you must begin by understanding why it is necessary to be disciplined, and what it implies. Freedom is not a result. Freedom begins when you are aware and that awareness does not only apply to discipline, but to the whole process of living. So freedom can only come into being when the mind is free, when it is not conditioned by a pattern, by a discipline. When do you discover anything? When you are spontaneous, when you are absolutely free, not when you are bound and blind. To discover the real God, there must be freedom and you cannot be free to discover when your mind is trained after a pattern, trained according to a desire. Which does not mean that mind must be vagrant. When you become aware of the vagrancy of the mind, of the wanderings of the mind there is already freedom. You speak of discipline, the means to establish the end. Yet the need is not the real, because it is created by the mind and what you gain is not the real. Truth must come to you and you cannot go to truth and to receive truth there must be freedom to think clearly, deeply, profoundly. There must be choiceless awareness, not condemnation nor identification, but awareness. You will find that there are different ways of looking at discipline. Discipline prevents thinking and it is only in spontaneity that any freedom can be real, that the immeasurable can be known.

November 2, 1947

## **MADRAS 4TH PUBLIC TALK 9TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

I would request you to listen to these talks, not so much with the idea of learning, but letting what I am saying take root. If it is true it will take root unconsciously and if it is not true it will fall off and so you do not have to bother. Because, what is true is absorbed instantaneously by the unconscious and what is not true, though it is implanted in the unconscious, gradually falls off. So, if I may suggest, these talks should really be extended and discussed every day. There is something new happening to all of us every Sunday and these talks are really meant to awaken, to quicken that intelligence. If I may make a resume of what we have already discussed, I think it will be possible to extend more and more what I have been saying about self-knowledge, that is, we will be able to go further by approaching it from different angles each time.

The other day we were discussing with many friends why each one of us, and therefore the world, is so consumed with the sense of property and class division. Why is it that each one of us gives such significance to acquisitiveness and to social, national and racial divisions? Why is it that all our problems seem to revolve around possession and name? I do not know whether you have thought about this from this point of view. Why is it that property with all its implications, name and nationality, racial and class divisions, fills our minds? There must be some reason. Mustn't there be? And we have tried to solve our problem from that point of view; property, acquisitiveness, possessiveness, racial and class divisions and so on. This is what is happening in the world. We are

trying to solve our problems in either of these two ways. Now, why is it that they fill our minds? It would be worthwhile to discuss this with each one of you and really go into it but that is impossible because there are too many persons here. So I can only point out the problem and I hope you will think about it afterwards.

Now, I said that we are consumed by these two ideas. Why is it that all our civilization is based on these ideas? Why is it that we are wrangling, quarrelling, going to war about these two ideas and why is it that we are trying to solve all our problems from the point of view of these two ideas? Is it not because we are seeking security? That food, clothing and shelter are very essential is an obvious fact. Yet we seem to be incapable of solving this question. So, why have these rudimentary demands taken such a deep hold of our minds? Is it not because we have no greater value? If you are interested in something greater, the lesser would not have such predominating value. In other words, secondary values when given consuming importance bring disaster and misery as they are doing now in the world. So why is there no greater value though all the books, the sacred books, say that there is a greater value? You must seek why; have you not tried it? If we did seek why, where has it led us to? Again to class division. Though you are seeking God and all the rest of it, the result is still division, division between the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Christian, the Muslim and so on. So when the mind seeks security, certainty, there can be no greater value than the sensate. After all, acquisition and class division are psychological factors. They are not materialistic values. They are psychological demands. So psychologically when we are seeking security it only creates values that are made by the hand or by the

mind and therefore there can be no greater value and so sensible values become all important. Obviously we must have legislation and some kind of control but that does not solve the problem because revolution after revolution has come and we still stay the same. We are in the same misery and in the same confusion and nothing has been solved.

So, how is the greater value to be found? This is significant. If I am really interested in something greater, I will not give such significance to the secondary, to the lesser. As I have not found a greater interest, the secondary becomes all important and how am I to find the greater? I can only find it by understanding the psychological demand for security. I think this is the problem which we have to face, not the problem of food, clothing and shelter, because even when we have food, clothing and shelter, we still demand security for our inner needs. So, when we seek security we will have to ask, is there any security? Is there psychological security? We are all seeking it. We want to have food, clothing, shelter, but we also want to find security in names, class divisions, property, beliefs, definite ideas. This is the way in which the mind constantly seeks to be secure, to be certain, and we have assumed that there is such a thing as security and on it we are building our whole civilization, the whole structure of our thoughts, religious thoughts as well as those of every day existence. We have never asked ourselves, is there security, is there certainty? If there is not we will have to alter our whole existence. So, the problem then is not food, clothing and shelter for it can be solved.

When the mind is seeking security, it must create the lesser

values which are sensate values; and then sensate values become all important. So, is there security? Is there psychological certainty? You are going to find it out. We can only find it out through self-knowledge. So, I come back to that point again with a different approach. That is, as long as the mind is seeking security, when it is seeking psychological security, it only creates sensate values, the known values, sensory values, and it is caught in these values. But, if the mind is enquiring whether there is security, then sensate values become of less significance. I may tell you there is no security or somebody else can tell you there is security; but that will have no significance. But if you can discover it for yourself, then it will become extraordinarily clear, which is not the result of our own projection. So, self-knowledge is important in the sense that while you explore your own mind you begin to discover fundamentally and basically whether such a thing as security exists, whether reality is certainty; and self-knowledge has an extraordinary creative significance, if we treat it as an experiment, and not try to achieve a result; if we experiment with ourselves and live experimentally then every relationship becomes a process of self-revelation; if I am related to you and in daily contact with you I am being revealed to myself, the way I think, the way I feel and act; if I am observant and aware of that relationship in daily life, the process of my thinking, my meditations, my demands become revealed to me. But I can only have self-knowledge if I am aware. When I am aware I can see that one of the major difficulties in relationship whether it be relationship with one or with many - is our desire to be secure, because after all can relationship exist on uncertainty? Can you feel insecure with your wife and your



children? Because as soon as you feel insecure, you begin to inquire. The moment you are certain you go to sleep. Thus, self-knowledge becomes extraordinarily significant when one begins to enquire whether there is any certainty, and question the mind which is ever seeking, pursuing the known.

I do not know if you have observed the process of your thinking; but if you have, you will see that your thought is always moving from the known to the known, or to an unknown of its own creation which it then pursues until it becomes the worship of God. You have created God because it is the ultimate security; and if you observe very carefully your own way of thinking, your own feeling, you will see that they are absorbed in security. Yet truly, it is in uncertainty, in freedom, that you can discover what freedom is, not in certainty, nor in possessiveness, nor in the divisions of beliefs or of names. Property, belief have become all important because we have pursued certainty through sensate values, sensory values that the mind can create or the hand can create, because in them there seems to be security. But, if you went deeply into the whole problem of security, then sensory values would be of very small importance.

Question: Will you please explain further what you mean by meditation?

Krishnamurti: First of all let us see exactly what takes place, what the problem is, then we can have understanding. Only then will we find the answer. What do we generally mean by meditation? Let us examine what happens when we meditate. We are not condemning it. We are not judging it. We are merely examining what we actually do when we meditate because if we

understand the problem we can understand the solution, the answer to it.

So what do we do when we sit down and meditate? First of all, whenever we give importance to a belief we erect a barrier. You do it because you have been told to do it. Secondly, if you sit down and meditate, your mind wanders hopelessly all over the place. Because you have been told, that your mind is subtle and that you must concentrate on one idea and exclude all other ideas, you spend your time in conflict, trying to concentrate on one idea, while all the time your mind flits all over the place. If you sit in front of a picture you try to concentrate on that picture, or else on a word or on a phrase or on a quality. Because of your desire to be secure, you concentrate on something positive, like a picture or a phrase or an idea, or a quality. The idea has generally been formulated by the mind or taken out of a book. This is what we do and this is the actual picture, is it not? I do not know if you sit down and meditate, perhaps you do not; if you do, is that not what really, actually takes place? Now, is that meditation?

So far we have considered a man that can fix his mind on one thing, as if this were something remarkable. If he can fix in his mind the idea of God which is an idea created by himself, or a word, or a phrase, and be consumed by that idea, that word, that phrase, you think he is a great religious man; and then you will also say that the man knows how to create. Isn't it so? What I mean is that the mind being vagrant, wandering, disorderly, but seeking orderliness, security, pursues one exclusive idea, generally a verbal idea; and when someone can dwell completely in an idea and be identified with it, we call him a great man. Yet the idea is a mere

projection. The phrase is made by the man, is it not? The word is repeated by the man. So, as long as there is repetition, you are putting yourself in a trance by means of a phrase, a word, an idea; and going far into a trance, you will call that meditation, which is only identification with a projected idea; because reality is inconceivable, unknowable and you cannot think about the unknowable, you can only think about the knowable. And what you know is not the truth and therefore when you create the known you only experience a process of self-hypnosis. Is that meditation? To go into a trance, to concentrate on a thing with which you are completely identified, which is a projection of yourself? Is that not what we are doing? Is that right? What we do restlessly when in meditation is merely moving from the known to the known and therefore it is not the discovery of the unknown. After all, man is the result of the past and when the mind thinks of something in the future, it has translated the past into the future and therefore it is not the real. So if this is not the true process, then what is the true process? How to discover the unknown is the problem. After all the purpose of meditation is to discover reality, not to hypnotize yourself about the reality. Meditation is, after all, the discovery of beauty, love. But you can discover nothing by mesmerizing yourself, or by becoming stupefied by a phrase, or by a map, or by concentrating on something which is exclusive of all else. it is a form of self-hypnosis.

So, the problem is, whether it is possible to discover the unknowable, isn't it? What you seek is the unknowable. If you experience it and merely live in the experience-all experiences are of the past - then it is not the real. So, for example you feel an

extraordinary clarity, a vision of beauty and truth. The mind records this experience in memory and clings to it, thus breaking away from the unknown. Memory becomes a hindrance to the unknowable. How then would you find out that which is not conceivable, that which cannot be formulated, that which is immeasurable, the real? This is the problem, in meditation, is it not? Meditation is not a prayer, it is not a problem of concentration, we have gone into that. Can meditation - which is the result of the known, of the past - discover the unknowable, the unknown? Can my mind, which is the result of the known, of the past, understand, experience the unknowable, the timeless, the eternal? What is the answer? It can only know the eternal, the timeless when it is not caught in time. The mind can know the truth only when the mind is free from time, the known. So how can the mind which is the result of the past, free itself from an idea, a phrase, from devotion to a superior entity, all of which are inventions of the mind? It is obvious that when the mind suggests a superior entity, it is already the known entity. I do not know if you will see the implication in this.

So, the problem then is not how to meditate, which is really a wrong question. 'How' implies method. Method is the known and the known can only lead you to the known. The means creates the end. If the means is the known the end is the known.

So, the problem is the mind which moves from the known to the known. You study to find the unknowable, the eternal, the timeless. The mind cannot see the real unless it frees itself from the known. What is the known? The accumulated memory is constantly gathering ideas, possessions or distinctions. Can mind free itself

from its own creations? Can mind, which is the result of time, free itself from time? Because when it is itself free from time, the timeless is. Mind is not searching for the timeless. It does not know what the timeless is. So, how can the mind free itself from time, from the past, the present and the future? It can free itself only from time, from the present, by being aware of everything, of all that we are doing now, of all thinking, of all feeling, by being aware now and not tomorrow. For, the present is the door to time, to the understanding of time and the present exists in what you are thinking, not in the time indicated by the clock, the time-table, or your routine. But in becoming aware of what you are thinking now you will discover why you are thinking and what you are thinking. That is, if you are aware, you will begin to see that you condemn, judge, identify or find excuses. But that does not help you to know what you are thinking and what is the cause of your thinking and your reaction to it. So, it is in knowing what you are thinking, in the constant awareness of what you are thinking, feeling, doing, that you will find the beginning of self-knowledge, not only knowledge of your self-conscious, but also of all the hidden activities. This is the beginning of self-knowledge and therefore self-knowledge is the beginning of meditation and there can be no meditation without self-knowledge. To meditate there must be self-knowledge.

So, the question 'How to meditate' is a wrong question because it merely asks for a method, the known, a technique which is the known to find the unknowable. See how ridiculous it is. The means creates the end and if the means is the known then the end also is the known and therefore it is not the unknowable, the timeless. So

the beginning of meditation is the beginning of self - knowledge. That is, through awareness the mind begins to be aware of its own activities and to know the whole process of the mind is not a question of time. But, if you begin to be aware, choicelessly, that is without condemnation, without justification, without identification, which is extremely difficult, then self-knowledge becomes extremely creative. After all that which is creative is creation, the Real.

Question: I am beginning to realize that I am very lonely. What am I to do? (Laughter.)

Krishnamurti: I wonder why you laugh, Do you laugh because you despise loneliness or because you think that it is something which does not concern you. You must be so busy with social activities that you cannot bother about yourself, nor feel your loneliness. Is that the reason why we laugh? it will be very interesting, Sirs, to find out within yourself why you laugh because then you will open the way to self-knowledge and if you pursue self-knowledge really, ardently, it will lead you to amazing heights and depths, to extraordinary joy, tribulation, which you will never know otherwise.

The questioner wants to know, why he feels loneliness? Do you know what loneliness means and are you aware of it? I doubt it very much because we have smothered ourselves in activities, in books, in relationships, in ideas which really prevent us from being aware of loneliness. So, what do we mean by loneliness? It is a sense of being empty, of having nothing, of being extraordinarily uncertain, with no anchorage anywhere. It is not despair, nor hopelessness, but a sense of void, a sense of emptiness and a sense

of frustration. I am sure we have all felt it, the happy and the unhappy, the very, very active and those who are addicted to knowledge. They all know this. The sense of real inexhaustible pain, a pain that cannot be covered up though we do try to cover it up.

So, let us approach again this problem to see what is actually taking place, to see what you do when you feel lonely. You try to escape from your feeling of loneliness, you try to pick up a book, you follow some leader, or you go to a cinema, or you become socially very, very active, or you go and worship and pray, or you paint, or you write a poem about loneliness. That is what is actually taking place. Becoming aware of loneliness, the pain of it, the extraordinary and fathomless fear of it, you seek an escape, and that escape becomes more important and therefore your activities, your knowledge, your gods, your radios all become important. Don't they? I said, when you give importance to secondary values, they lead you to misery and chaos; and the secondary values inevitably are the sensate values and modern civilization based on these gives you this escape - escape through your job, escape through your family, escape through your name, escape through your studies, escape through painting, etc; all our culture is based on that escape. Our civilization is founded on that and that is a fact.

Have you ever tried to be alone? When you do, you will feel how extraordinarily difficult it is and how extraordinarily intelligent we must be to be alone, because the mind will not let you be alone. The mind becomes restless, it busies itself with escapes. So what is it that we are doing? We try to fill this extraordinary void with the known. We discover how to be active,

how to be social, we know how to study, how to turn on the radio. So we are filling that thing which we do not know, with the things we know. We try to fill that emptiness with various kinds of knowledge, relationship or things. With these three we are trying to fill it. Is that not so? That is our process, that is our existence. Now when you realize what you are doing, do you still think you can fill that void? You have tried every means of filling this void of loneliness. Have you succeeded in filling it? You have tried cinemas and you did not succeed and therefore you go after your gurus, your books or you become socially very active. Have you succeeded in filling it or have you merely covered it up? If you have merely covered it up, it is still there. Therefore, it will come back and if you are able to escape altogether then you are locked up in an asylum or you become very, very dull. That is what is happening in the world.

Can this emptiness, this void be filled? If not, can we run away from it, escape from it? And if we have experienced and found one escape to be of no value, are not therefore all other escapes of no value? Therefore it does not matter whether you fill the emptiness with this or with that. Meditation is also an escape. So it does not matter much that you change your escape.

How then will you find what to do about this loneliness? You can only find what to do when you have stopped escaping. Is not that so? That is, when you are willing to face what is, which means you must not turn on the radio, which means you must turn your back to civilization, then that loneliness comes to an end because it is completely transformed. It is no longer loneliness. Because if you understand what is, then what is, is the real. Because the mind



is continuously avoiding, escaping, refusing to see what is, it creates its own hindrances. Because we have ever so many hindrances that are preventing us from seeing, we do not understand what is and therefore we are getting away from reality; and all these hindrances have been created by the mind in order not to see what is. Because to see what is, not only requires a great deal of capacity and awareness of action, but it also means turning your back on everything that you have built up, your bank account, your name and everything that we call civilization. When you see what is you will find how loneliness is transformed. Question: Are you not becoming our leader?

Krishnamurti: There are several ideas involved in this question; that I should enter politics; that I should help to lead India out of this present chaos and so on. Let us examine this question and see what it means. First of all, why do you want a leader; the question is not whether I am a leader and you are a follower. Why does one become a leader and why does one wish to be a follower, whether the leader be a man or a guru? We want a leader because we are uncertain. We do not know what to think; we are confused and because in our confusion we do not know what to do, we want somebody to protect us. Politically it becomes the tyranny of a dictator. That is what is happening and what is going to happen. When there is confusion, and psychologically we are confused, we want somebody to lead us. In the world there is confusion, misery, chaos, exploitation by the rich, by the capitalist, by the clever, by the intelligent, by those who have got a system and these become leaders, create a party and because we do not want anarchy we let them lead us. We do not want to be confused, we want somebody

to tell us what to do. And so, we create leaders. Why do we create them?

Why do we hanker after leaders; why are we looking for leaders? Is it not because we want to be secure? We do not want to be uncertain about anything. Now, what happens? You not only create a leader but you become the follower. That is, you destroy yourself by following another. When you follow a tradition blindly, or follow a leader or a party, when you discipline yourself, are you not destroying your own thinking process? Instead there is confusion but nobody is going to bring order except yourself. Here is a marvellous state of confusion and you do not want to look at it. We want somebody to take us away from it. Then what happens? What do the leaders do? They get up and talk and they become leaders. But what they promise they must fulfil in action and when they cannot they feel frustrated.

So, exploitation exists not only between the worker and the owner, but also between the follower and the leader, because if the leader does not lead he feels lost. If the leader does not get up and talk on the platform what is he? You not only create the leader but because of his own frustration and confusion you are also exploiting him. Exploitation is mutual. Haven't you noticed this? As the leader depends upon you and you depend upon the leader where are we going to be led to?

This desire to create a leader is a form of self-fulfilment. You fulfil yourself in a leader and he fulfills himself in you, by seeking to save you, to guide you. But he is the leader you have created and therefore it is mutual exploitation, mutual self-fulfilment and therefore it is leading nowhere. Obviously it is exploitation, when

it is only a self-fulfilment through organization. If there is self-fulfilment then it must lead to frustration and as we do not want to be frustrated we are always trying to watch for the inevitable. And therefore the leader becomes very important. He has to be the leader and you have to be the follower.

Now, I do not want to fulfil myself in that way. I do not believe in self-fulfilment, it leads to misery. It leads to chaos and as I do not depend on you financially or for my psychological demands, I am not your leader. It does not matter to me whether there is one or many or none to listen to me. I do not believe in mutual exploitation, it leads to such absurd indignities and intrigues and therefore I am not your leader and you are not going to make me your leader. That is very simple, because there must be the two, those who want to lead and those who want to be led. As I do not want to lead, nor to follow anybody I am out of that class. Because true reality is not found through following anybody, it is not self-fulfilment. It comes into being only when the self is absent, when there is freedom from psychological demands, when the mind is free to act in pursuing anything. The pursuit is indicative of creation and when all desires cease then there is reality.

Question: What is the difference between belief and confidence? Why do you condemn belief? Krishnamurti: First of all let us see what is belief and what is confidence. What do we mean by belief? Why do we have to believe? Is it not because we have a desire to be certain, to be secure? Psychologically it is disturbing not to have a belief, is it not? If you have no belief in God, in a political party, you will be very disturbed. Would you not? Fear, belief in reincarnation, in dozens of things. So, belief is

a demand to be secure made by the mind and therefore what happens? The mind seeking security, seeking belief, creates belief. Either it creates it for itself or it takes the beliefs of others and whether it has created it or has taken it over from others, the mind holds on to it, and says 'I believe'. Or it projects the belief into the future and makes out of it a certainty, a security according to which it disciplines itself. As various factors are bound to lead to different beliefs, you believe in God and another believes there is no God. You are a Muslim and another is a Hindu or a Christian and then what happens? Belief divides. Does it not? The desire to be secure psychologically is bound to create division because you are creating, giving importance to various things that are secondary.

See what belief is doing in the world. Politically or religiously there are innumerable schemes which you believe to be the solvent of our difficulties. There are religious beliefs of such extraordinary varieties, and each individual pursues his own belief because it brings him comfort, and becomes a means of propaganda and exploitation. Belief inevitably separates. If you have a belief or when you seek security in your particular belief you become separated from those who are seeking security in other forms of belief. Therefore, all organized beliefs are based on separatism, though they may preach brotherhood. That is exactly what is happening in the world because belief is a hidden psychological demand for self-fulfilment. That is, by fulfilling yourself by means of a belief, you think you will be happy. Therefore, belief becomes an extraordinarily important factor in religion, in politics, etc.

If you feel you are a human being, do you think you would be fighting like this? Hindu and you are fighting with a Mussalman

and you are killing each other; the English fought the Germans and so on. So belief is formed because of a desire for self-fulfilment, for security; and because we demand security and strive for it, we have an end and the end is a projection of ourselves. If the end were unknown we would not believe. It is a projection of the self and therefore it creates separatism and it becomes a barrier between you and another and that is exactly what is happening. I am not inventing a theory, but I am describing a fact, psychologically as well as organizationally a fact. We all believe in a pattern because we feel it to be very safe, the leader as well as the follower. If you analyse belief very carefully and look into it you will find that it is a form of self-fulfilment, of mutual exploitation, and that it does not lead to any answer. That is what belief has done for us.

And what do we mean by confidence? Most of us confide in someone or feel confidence in something. If you have practised something, read books, etc., it gives you a certain confidence, because you have practiced, done it over and over again with confidence. It is a form of aggressiveness. You can do something and therefore you feel delighted with yourself - "I can do something and you cannot." Confidence in a name, in a capacity - such confidence is aggression. Is it not? Such confidence is also self-exploitation which again is akin to belief. Therefore belief and confidence are similar. They are the two sides of the same coin.

Now, there is another kind of confidence which comes through self-knowledge. It should not really be called confidence, but for the lack of a better word we will call it 'confidence'. When there is awareness, when the mind is aware of what it is thinking, feeling,

doing, not only in the superficial layer of consciousness but in the deeper hidden layers, when we are fully aware of all the implications, then there comes a sense of freedom, a sense of assurance, because you know. When you know a cobra you are free from it, aren't you? When you know something is poisonous there is an assurance, there is a freedom that was unknown hitherto. There is an assurance, an extraordinary joy, a creative hope, a sense of aliveness when the self has been explored none of which is based on belief. When the self has been explored and all its tricks and corners are known to the mind, then the mind is assured of its creator. Therefore it ceases to create and in that cessation there is creation.

Sirs, please do not be hypnotized. You may be, as I said in the beginning of the talk, in that receptive mood when the seed is set in place, takes root. I hope sincerely that the seed has been planted because it is not words, it is not listening to me which will free you. What is going to free you, to deliver each one of us from sin and suffering is that realization, that awareness of what is. To know what it is exactly; not to translate it, not to explain it away, not to condemn; to know exactly what it is and to perceive it without obstruction brings freedom. That is freedom and through that freedom alone can truth be known.

November 9, 1947

## **MADRAS 5TH PUBLIC TALK 16TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

It would be very interesting if we could take the journey together into self-exploration but unfortunately the difficulty with most of us is that we are used to watching rather than partaking; we would watch the game and be the spectators rather than the actual players. I think it would be beneficial if we could all play the game and be creative, and not only watch one person think, feel, live. The difficulty with most of us is that we have forgotten how to play in the sense of partaking, sharing and discovering for ourselves. We are accustomed to being told what to do, what to think and what the right action is. We are so unaccustomed to discover for ourselves the process of our own thinking from which alone action takes place. So, if we can, let us not be mere spectators but let us actually partake in what is being discussed; which means we must establish a fully communicable relationship between ourselves, between you and me. Most of us have relationship verbally and the difficulty is to go beyond that verbal level to a deeper level so that we can understand the identical thing instantly; because, after all communication has purpose only when both understand. You may understand but if I do not, then communication between us ceases and the difficulty always is to establish the right kind of communication on the identical level and at the same time, so that there can be instantaneous comprehension. So, it would be worthwhile I think, if we could take the journey together and not for you merely to watch me take the journey and tell you or describe to you the results of my journey. That would be utterly

futile.

What we have been discussing the last few Sundays can be stated in a very few words, I think; and the simpler the statement, the more clear it will be. But unfortunately if it is oversimplified, the problem itself becomes non-existent. Yet the problem is there. Our problem is about the search for happiness and the overcoming of sorrow. We want happiness and yet our constant companion is sorrow. Now let us take the journey together and find out what we think of the problem, as though it were new and not as though I was merely describing what has been taking place in you and you were merely listening to me and communicating my meaning to yourselves. Let us be aware together, at the same time, on the same level, so that we can really go into it deeper and deeper at every discussion and every talk.

We seek happiness, do we not, through things, through relationship, through ideas or thought? So, things, relationship and ideas, and not happiness, become all important. That is, whenever we seek happiness through something, the thing becomes important and not happiness. When stated like that it sounds very simple, and it is very simple. Because we seek happiness in property, in family, in ideas, the property, family and ideas become all important; we expect to find happiness through something. Now, can happiness be found through anything? Things made by the hand or by the mind have assumed greater significance than happiness itself, and because, things, relationship and ideas are so obviously impermanent, we are always unhappy. That is, we seek happiness through things and we find that there is no happiness. If we examine a little bit more closely we will find that happiness



does not come through things. Then again, if we shift to another level, the level of relationship between ourselves and others, whether it be the society, the family or the nation, we see the enormous difficulty of adjustment between ourselves and others. So, if you observe it very closely you will find that there is an extraordinary impermanency in relationship, though we try to anchor ourselves in relationship and make it a refuge and a security. Similarly with ideas. One system of ideas can be broken down by another system of ideas and so on. Yet we do not seem to realize the impermanency of all things - using the word not in its metaphysical but in its purely ordinary sense. Things are impermanent; they wear out. In the case of relationships, there is constant friction. The same is true for ideas and beliefs which have no stability. Yet we seek our happiness in them because we do not realize the impermanency of things, of ideas and relationships. And so after trying one set of relationships, one set of things, we move to another, from one page to another, hoping to find happiness and we never find it. So, sorrow becomes our constant companion and the overcoming of sorrow our chief problem.

How can we overcome it? We have never asked ourselves whether happiness can be found through something, through knowledge, through contact or through God. Can happiness be achieved through an object, either an ideological object or a physical object? Sorrow is inevitable as long as we seek happiness through something. is it not a fact that we seek happiness through something and when we do not find it in this world we move to the next world; when we do not find it in the family, in virtue, in ideas, we try to find it through a permanent entity called God? So it is

always through something, through an object.

So the problem is: can happiness, which is never found through anything, be found at all? If I cannot find it through something, can it exist or am I only happy when I am not seeking, when I do not want happiness through anything? Can happiness exist by itself? To find that out we have to explore the river of self - knowledge. But, self-knowledge is not an end in itself. It is like following a stream to its source. Is there a source to a stream? Surely not. Every drop from the beginning to the end makes the river, and to imagine that we will find happiness at the source is an error. Happiness cannot be found through anything but only by following the river of self-knowledge, that is oneself.

So our difficulty lies in that we have to follow not only our conscious but also our unconscious motives, demands and purposes. Those of us who have listened somewhat earnestly, must have made the experiment of following thoughts and feelings consciously. That is, by becoming aware of conscious thoughts and feelings and ideas, we clear the mind of all conflict and all tribulations and confusions and begin to receive the unconscious thoughts and intimations. So in order to begin following the stream of self-knowledge there must be a clarification of the conscious, that is one must be aware of what is consciously taking place. That is, by becoming aware of the conscious activities, which I assure you is quite difficult, the unconscious thoughts and hidden intentions and motives can be understood. So, as the conscious is the present, the now, through the present the unconscious and hidden thoughts can be understood; and the unconscious and hidden thoughts cannot be understood through any other means

except by becoming intensely aware of the present and by freeing ourselves from those complications, incompleting actions and thoughts that are constantly creeping into the conscious mind.

So, all of us who really want to experiment, who really want to undertake the journey must free the thoughts in our conscious mind. That is, to make it simpler, the conscious mind is surely occupied with the immediate problems, the job, the family, studies, politics, the Brahmin and the non-Brahmin and so on. So, without our understanding those problems of the conscious mind and doing away with them, how can we proceed further? And to sweep that clear, is this not our constant problem of living? With these problems we are occupied, the state, nationalism, class division, property, relationship and ideas that constantly float into the conscious mind. How are we to solve the problem of property and class division? - property that creates so much hatred and enmity and class divisions and brings such conflict and despair? With that, our conscious mind is actually occupied. And if we do not clear that up, surely we cannot go very far and follow up the stream of self-knowledge.

So what we want first is that extraordinary beginning of taking a step. So those who want to make the journey across to the other shore, to see and discover where self-knowledge leads them must surely be aware consciously of what they are thinking, feeling and their habits, their traditions and their verbal expressions, the manner of their speech to their wives, to their servants, and to their immediate superiors. That will reveal how the mind is working and from there you can proceed and as you proceed you discover; and discovery of the real is happiness and it is not through something,

but is in itself as love is, eternal; love is eternal not because you love somebody, love is in itself eternal.

Question: I have been told that you do not read any philosophical or religious literature. I can hardly believe this as when I listen to you I realize that you must have read or have some secret source of knowledge. Please be frank.

Krishnamurti: I have not read any sacred literature, neither the Bhagavad Gita nor the Upanishads. I have not read any philosophical treatise, modern or ancient; and there is no secret source of knowledge either, because you and I are the source of knowledge. We are the reservoir of everything and of all the knowledge. Because we are the result of the past, and in understanding ourselves we uncover the whole knowledge and therefore all wisdom. Therefore self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom and we can find that ourselves without reading a book, without going to any leader or following any 'yogi'. It requires enormous persistency, an alertness of mind and I assure you that when you begin to explore, there is a delight, there is an ecstasy that is incomparable. But as most of our minds are drugged with other people's ideas and books, and as our minds are constantly repeating what someone else said, we have become repeaters and not thinkers. When you quote the Bhagavad Gita or the Bible or some Chinese Sacred Books, surely you are merely repeating. Are you not? And what you are repeating is not the truth. It is a lie, for truth cannot be repeated. A lie can be extended, propounded and repeated but not truth; and when you repeat truth, it ceases to be truth and therefore sacred books are unimportant because through self-knowledge, through yourself, you can discover the eternal. It is

really a most arduous task, for self-knowledge has no beginning or conclusion with a solution at the end. It has no beginning and no end. You must begin where you are, read every word, every phrase and every paragraph and you cannot read if you are condemning, if you are justifying, if you pursue verbally and deny the painful, and if you are not awake to every implication of thought. You can only be awake when there is spontaneity because a controlled mind is a disciplined mind and it can never understand itself because it is fixed in a pattern. But there are moments when even the disciplined minds, the drugged minds are spontaneous and in these spontaneous moments we can discover, we can go beyond the illusions of the mind. So, as there is no secret source and as there is no wisdom in any book you will find that the real is very near for it is in yourself and that requires extraordinary activity, constant alertness. Self-knowledge does not come by studying in a room by yourself. If the mind is alert yet passive you can follow every second of the day and even when one sleeps the mind is functioning. If during the day you are alert, extraordinarily awake, you will see that the mind has received intimations, hints which can be pursued during the night. So really a man who wants to discover truth, the real, the eternal, must abandon all books, all systems, all gurus, because that which is to be found will only be found when one understands oneself.

Question: At present in this country our government is attempting to modify the system of education. May we know your ideas on education and how it can be imparted?

Krishnamurti: This is an enormous subject and to try to answer it in a few minutes, is quite absurd because its implications are so

vast, but we will state it as clearly and as simply as possible because there is a great joy in seeing a thing clearly without being influenced by other peoples' notions and ideas and instructions, whether they be the government, or the specialists or the very learned in education. What has happened in the world after centuries of education? We have had two catastrophic wars which have almost destroyed man, that is, man as a means of knowledge. We see that education has failed because it has resulted in the most dreadful destruction that the world has ever known. So what has happened? Seeing that education has failed, governments are stepping in to control education. Are they not? They want to control the way in which you should be educated, what you think, not how you think, but what you think. So, when the government steps in, there is regimentation as has happened throughout the world. Governments are not concerned with the happiness of the masses, but they are concerned with producing an efficient machine; and as our age is a technical age they want technicians who will create the marvellous modern machine called society. These technicians will function efficiently and therefore automatically. This is what is happening in the world, whether the government is of the left or of the right. They do not want you to think but if you do think, then you must think along a particular line or according to what religious organizations say. We have been through this process, the control by the organized religion, by the priests and by the government. It has resulted in disaster and in the exploitation of man. Whether man is exploited in the name of God or in the name of the government, it is the same thing. As man is human he eventually breaks up the system. So that is one of the

problems; as long as education is the hand-maiden of the government there is no hope. This is the tendency we find everywhere in the world at the present time whether it is inspired by the right or by the left, because if you are left free to think for yourself you may revolt and therefore you will have to be liquidated. There are various methods of liquidation which we need not go into.

Sirs, in considering education we will have to find out the purpose of education, the purpose of living. If that is not clear to you why educate yourself? What is significant? What are we living for? What are we struggling for? If that is not clear to you education has no significance. Has it? One period will be technical, another period will be religious, the next period will be something else again and so on. We are talking about a system and so is it not important to find out what it is all about. Are you merely being educated in order to get a job? Then you make living a means to a job and you make of yourself a man to fit into a groove. Is that the purpose? We must think of this problem in that light and not merely repeat slogans. To a life that is not free from systems whether they be modern or ancient, free of even the most advanced and progressive ideas, education will have no meaning. If you do not know why you are living, what is the purpose of being educated, then why make so much fuss about how you are educated. As it is, you are being led to the cannon. You are becoming cannon fodder. If that is what we want then certainly we must make ourselves extremely efficient to kill each other and that is what is happening. Is it not? There are more armies, more armaments, more money invested in producing bacteriological

warfare and atomic destruction than ever before in history and in order to accomplish all this you must be technicians of the highest order and therefore you are becoming tools of destruction. Is not all this due to education? You are becoming fodder for cannons, regimented minds. Or else you become an industrialist, a big businessman grabbing after money and if this does not interest you, you, become addicted to knowledge, to books or you aspire to be a scientist caught in his laboratory. And if there is any higher purpose to our lives and if we do not discover it, then life has very little significance; it is as if we committed suicide and we are committing suicide when we make ourselves into machines, either religious machines or political machines. So if we do not discover what the purpose of life is, education has very little significance.

Then, what is the need or the purpose of our living? I am not telling you and do not expect me to tell you. We are taking the journey together. We must turn our back against divisions and distinctions, that is, we must find what is the real, what is God, what is eternity and what is happiness; because a man who is already happy is not bothered at all. A man in love loves everybody. For him there is no class distinction. He does not want to liquidate somebody because that somebody has more. If happiness is the end, then what we are doing now has no significance. To find reality there must be freedom, freedom from conditioned thinking, so as to discover if there is not something beyond the sensate values. Not the absurd political freedom, but freedom from conditioning, from the, psychological demands that condition thought. Does freedom come through education, through any system of government whether of the left or of the right? Can



parents, environment give freedom? If so, environment becomes extraordinarily important because parents must be educated as well as the educator. If the educator is confused, conditioned, narrow, limited, bound by superstitious ideas, whether modern or ancient, the child will suffer. The educator therefore is far more important, that is, to educate the educator is far more important than educating the child. That means the parents and the teachers should be educated first. Do they want to be educated, altered or revolutionized? Not in the least, for the very simple reason that they want permanency. They want 'status quo', things as they are, with wars and competition and a political world in which everybody is confused, pulling at each other, destroying each other.

You ask me what I should do about education. It is too vast a subject. If you want things to be continued as they are, then you must accept the present system which brings constant wars and confusion, never a moment of peace in the world. And it is much more difficult to educate the educator than the child because the educator has already grown stupid. I do not think you realize what is happening in the world, how catastrophic it all is. The educator is becoming dull and he does not know what to do. He is confused. He goes from one system to another, from one teacher to another, from the oldest to the most ancient and yet he does not find what he is looking for, for the very simple reason that he has not located the source of confusion which is himself. How can such a man awaken intelligence in another? So, that is one of the problems.

What is the child? He is a product of yourself, is he not? So he is already conditioned, is he not? He is the result of the past and the present. The idea that if given freedom, the child would develop

naturally seems to be fallacious because after all the child is the father and the father is the child though with certain modifications of tendencies. To give freedom to a child you must first understand yourself, the giver of freedom, the educator. If I have to educate a child but do not understand myself and so start with my conditioned response, how can I teach him? How can I awaken intelligence in him? So that is part of the problem. Then there is the question of nourishment, care and love. Most of us have no real love for our children though we talk about it. Sirs, education is something tremendous and without love I do not possibly see how there can be education. The moment you love somebody you understand the person, your heart is in it. Do we love our children? Do we love our wives or husbands? Do we love our neighbours? We do not, because if we did there would be a different world. There is no true education through a system. If we love there must be instantaneous communication, on the same level and at the same time and because we ourselves are dry, empty, governments and systems have taken over. The educator becomes important, the environment becomes significant because we do not know how to love.

I am afraid you will say that I have said nothing positive about education. Is not negative thinking the highest form of thinking, for wisdom comes through negation. Do not put what I say into your old bottles and thus lose the perfume. Sirs, surely to transform the world there must be regeneration within ourselves. We find we have blueprints to educate our children but naturally blueprints have no love. Therefore you produce machines. We have brains but what has happened to them. We are becoming cannon fodder. We

are not creators. We are not thinkers. We do not know how to love, we are merely drudging with our routine minds and naturally we become inefficient and the government which wants efficiency for destruction is going to make us efficient. There is an efficiency inspired by love which is greater than the efficiency of machinery.

Question: The traditional method of reaching Adepts or Masters by training given by them or through their disciples is still said to be open to humanity. Are your teachings intended for those who are on that path?

Krishnamurti: Sirs, let us really go into this question of various paths leading to ultimate reality. A path can only lead to that which is known and that which is the known is not the truth. When you know something it ceases to be truth because it is past, it is entirely arrested. Therefore the known, the past is caught in the net of time and therefore it is not the truth, it is not the real. So, a path leading to the known cannot lead you to truth and a path can only lead to the known and not to the unknown. You take a path to a village, to a house, because you know where the house is in the village and there are many paths to your house, to your village. But reality is the immeasurable, the unknown. If you could measure it it would not be truth. Because what you have learned through books, through the say-so of others, is not real; it is only repetition and what is repeated is not truth any longer.

So, is there any path to truth? We have thought so far that all paths lead to truth. Do they? Does the path of the ignorant, the path of the man with ill will lead to truth? He must abandon all paths. Must he not? A man who is concerned with murdering people in the name of the state, can he find truth unless he abandons his

occupation? So all paths do not lead to truth. A man who is addicted to the acquiring of knowledge cannot find truth because he is concerned with knowledge and not with truth. The man who accepts division, will he find truth? Obviously not, because he has chosen a particular path and not the whole. Will the man of action find reality? Obviously not, for the simple reason that by following a part we cannot find the whole. That means knowledge, division and action separately cannot lead anywhere but to destruction, to illusion, to restlessness. That is what has happened. The man who has pursued knowledge for the sake of knowledge, believing that it would lead him to reality, becomes a scientist, yet what has marvellous science done to the world? I am not decrying science. The scientist is like you and me; only in his laboratory he differs from us. He is like you and me with his narrowness, with his fears and nationalism.

So a man who really seeks reality must have devotion, knowledge and action. They are not three separate paths leading to some extraordinary thing called reality. Yet, devotion to something is only another fantastic phase. Remove the object of his devotion, and the man is lost and he will fight and he will do everything to hold on to it. Therefore it is no longer devotion. It is merely an emotional outlet, centred upon something which he calls devotion, but a man who is really devoted, is devoted to the search itself and not to knowledge.

To believe that there is a path to the Masters, to the Adepts or a path reached through their disciples is also rather fantastic. Is it not? Because wisdom is not found through a disciple or through a Master. Happiness is not found through any means other than by

abandoning the idea that we are the chosen few, who travel along a special path. This idea merely gives us a sense of security, a sense of aggrandizement. The idea that yours is the direct path and that ours will take more time is the outcome of immature thinking.

Does it not divide mankind into systematized paths? It is those that are mature who will find the truth. He who is mature never pursues, whether it be the path of the Adepts or the path of knowledge, of science, of devotion or of action. A man who is committed to any particular path is immature and such a man will never find the eternal, the timeless, because the part, the particular to which he is committed belongs to time. Through time you can never find the timeless. Through misery you can never find happiness. Misery must be set aside if happiness is to be. If you love, in that love there can be no contention and no conflict. In the midst of darkness there is no light and when you get rid of darkness, you have light. Similarly, love is when there is no possessiveness, when there is no condemnation, when there is no self-fulfilment. Those of us who are committed to paths have vested interests, mental emotional and physical, and that is why we find it extremely difficult to become mature; how can we abandon that to which we have clung for the past fifty or sixty years? How can you leave your house and become once more a beggar just as you were when you were really seeking? Now you have committed yourself to an organization of which you are the head, the secretary or a member. To the man who is seeking, the search itself is love, that itself is devotion, that itself is knowledge. The man who has committed himself to a particular path or action is caught up in systems and he will not find truth. Through the part the whole is

never found. Through a little crack of the window we do not see the sky, the marvellous clear sky and the man who can see the sky clearly is the man who is in the open, away from all paths, from all traditions and in him there is hope and he will be the saviour of mankind.

Question: What profession would you advise me to take?

Krishnamurti: Each question is related to some other question. Each thought is related to another and is not separate. The profession, the path, education, self-knowledge are all intimately interrelated. You cannot merely choose a profession and pursue self-knowledge or choose a profession to be an educator. They are all interrelated. All actions, all feelings are interrelated and that is the beauty of it. If you take one thought you can go into the whole depth of thinking.

You ask: what profession would you advise me to take? If you want a right answer we must go into it fully. What is happening in this world? Is there any choice of profession? You take what you can jolly well get. You are lucky if you can get work. This is so in all parts of the world. Because we have lost all true values we have but one aim: to get money somehow to live. Since that value is predominating in the world there is no choice. If you are a B.A., B. Sc., or an M.A., you become a clerk. The structure of society is such that it leads to destruction. The society is geared to destroy. Every action that you do is leading to war.

I do not know if you are aware of it, but in the midst of this storm, and starvation, can you choose to become a lawyer, a soldier, or a policeman? When you really feel that mankind is on the brink of a catastrophe can you choose any of these three

professions? By becoming a soldier can you solve the world's problem? A soldier functions to destroy and he will destroy. He is trained to destroy like the policeman whose office is to watch, to report, to spy, to intrigue; and you know what it is to be a lawyer - a cunning man without much substance behind him. You are all lawyers and you know what you have done to the world by your cleverness and yet you are still turning out thousands of lawyers. What is their profession? To divide and to keep up division and on that they live. They do not live on human relationship and kindness and love but on cunning stupidity and intrigue. Can you join a man who makes money in the midst of this economic chaos? Can you know what starvation means?

So you see how limited the professions are. Sirs, before you can ask the question, what you are to do, you must know how to think rightly, not in a sloppy manner. Right thinking brings about right profession and right action. You cannot know how to think rightly without self-knowledge. Are you willing to spend the time to know yourself, so that you can think rightly and find the right profession? Those of you who are not compelled to choose immediately a profession, surely you can do something. Therefore, those of you who have leisure have the responsibility, those who have time to know and to observe. But those who can, do not. It is immensely difficult to choose a job in a civilized world of this kind where every action leads to destruction and exploitation. Many who are not pressed to choose a profession are those who can, but they do not, and that is the tragedy. You do not, because you are afraid. When the house is already on fire you still want to hold on to a few things. So the tragedy is not for those who have to choose a

profession, they are going to choose it willy-nilly, but it is for those who sit back and observe. Through right thinking alone can there be right action. Right thinking is not achieved through books, through past memories or through future hopes.

November 16, 1947.



## **MADRAS 6TH PUBLIC TALK 23RD NOVEMBER, 1947**

I think we ought to spend some time considering what is right listening. I think there is an art to listening. Most of us are accustomed to translate what is being said into our own terms, interpret it according to our own understanding, our background, our tradition. Is it not possible to listen as though we had no background at all, merely listen as we would listen to a song or music? You are not interpreting music when you are listening. You are listening to the silence in between two notes; you are attentive and sufficiently relaxed, sufficiently focussed to give your whole attention without any effort, because you feel a tremendous interest. Likewise when there is right communication - right communication exists only when there is affection, love - there is immediate response. There is no translation, there is no interpretation, there is comprehension at the same time, on the same level, but it is very rare to find people who love each other so completely that there is complete understanding. Most people meet, but on different levels and at different times, whereas what we are trying to do is not only to listen, but also at the same time to be creative, which is not merely following or accepting or denying verbally, but to experiment within yourself with what is being said as though you were following your own thoughts sufficiently alertly and yet silently. But the difficulty is that we do not know how to listen, how to see, and how to hear because when a thing that is said is new, we put it into old bottles, fit it into old terminologies and therefore we spoil it, like `new wine put into old

bottles'. What happens when you put new wine into old bottles? Fermentation starts and the bottles break and yet, I am afraid that is what most of us are doing. We do not approach our experience anew. We approach it anew only when there is a tremendous interest, when there is great love it is something new every second and not a continuation of the old or an interpretation according to a pattern or a system of thought.

So, if I may suggest, it would be worth. while if we could listen with that peculiar quality of creative attention, as though we were meeting something anew. As I said over and over again, a truth that is repeated ceases to be a truth and by merely hearing it, it becomes a repetition, which you translate into your own terms, which you fit into particular channels with which you are familiar and so it ceases to be the truth. Whereas if you listen with that intense creative understanding, creative stillness, which is not interpretation, then it is your truth and that is what liberates you and gives you freedom, gives you happiness. We miss that happiness, that creative joy, if we merely translate or absorb the old books, or hear the words of some teacher or saint. So, there can be happiness only when the mind is capable of receiving the new, but as our mind is the result of the old, it is extremely difficult to listen as though we have never heard it before. I do not know if you have listened to the songs of the birds in the morning. You must have. You never compare it to yesterday's song. It is new, it is something very lovely because your mind is fresh, untroubled by the day's activities and so is capable of hearing it as if for the first time even though the song is as old as the hills. Similarly, please listen to whatever I am saying as though you were hearing it anew,

and you will see an extraordinary thing taking place in yourself, because happiness is not something that is old, but happiness is something that is constantly renewing itself.

As I said last week, what is sought through an object or material or psychological, can never yield happiness. In that case what seems happiness is merely gratification which is always impermanent. So to understand happiness or to be happy, we must understand the process of becoming happy and that is what we are all trying to do. We are trying to become happy. We are trying to become virtuous. We are trying to become cleverer than we are. So if we can understand the becoming and the being, then perhaps we shall understand what happiness is.

Surely becoming and being are two wholly different states. Becoming is continuous and have you noticed that that which is continuous is always binding. Relationship is binding if it is merely continuous, if it is merely a habit. If it is merely a gratification, it is merely a habit. The moment it ceases to be continuous, there is a new quality in relationship and if you go into it further you will see that where there is continuity, habit, a thought process which is moving from continuity to continuity, there is always a bond of friction, of pain; yet if we do not understand this continuity, which is the becoming there is no being. You never say to yourself, 'I will become happy'. So, being can only be understood, when becoming ceases.

To put it differently, after all, virtue gives freedom. Have you ever noticed that an immoral man is stupid, because he is caught, he is miserable; while the really virtuous are free and happy and are not becoming something but being. That is, there can be

freedom only in virtue, because it is orderly, clear and free but a man who is not virtuous is disorderly and unclear and his mind is confused. So virtue is not an end in itself, but it creates that freedom without which reality cannot exist; but when we translate virtue as a means of becoming, then there is friction. So becoming and being virtuous are two wholly different states. Virtue is understanding, is it not? That which you understand brings freedom. That which you do not understand creates confusion, darkness and so on. The moment you understand something there is virtue. So, is understanding to come through effort, or is there a state in which effort has ceased for understanding to be? Does understanding come through effort, or does understanding come when there is no effort? Have you tested it or tried it? If I want to understand what you are saying, must I make an effort to listen? When I make an effort there are distractions. Then, distractions become more important than listening. Not being interested in what you are saying, I have to make an effort not to be distracted, in order to listen. Whereas if there is interest, if there is communion, then there is no effort. Now, you are listening to me without effort. The moment you make an effort, you have ceased to understand.

After all when you see a picture or a painting, do you make an effort? If you want to criticize, to compare, or to find out who painted it, then you have to make an effort. If you really want to understand, you sit quietly in front of it, if the picture appeals to you. In that quietness in which there is no distraction, you understand the beauty of the picture.

So, surely virtue comes without any effort. But since our whole existence is based on effort, we must find out why we are making

an effort, why this constant trouble, why this incessant battle to be something. To be something is what we are striving all day long, consciously or unconsciously. We strive to become something. I wonder if you have ever asked yourself why we are striving. Is striving inevitable? Is striving part of existence and what do we mean by making an effort. Essentially it is to be something other than what we are. Is it not so? You see what is and you do not like it and you want to be something else. The essential reason behind all effort is the desire to transform what is into something which is to be. I am stupid and I am striving to become clever. Can stupidity ever become cleverness or must stupidity merely cease? If we can understand that, we shall understand the whole significance of making an effort. That is, we are afraid to face what is. We are afraid to understand what is and therefore we always strive to transform, to move, to change. Surely a rose is not striving. It is what it is. In the very being there is a kind of creation. It does not desire to be other than what is. It knows no strife other than the natural strife to live. With us, there is not only the natural struggle to survive, that is, for food, clothing and shelter, but there is the struggle to transform that which is. Yet we do not understand that which is.

So the difficulty is to understand what is and a mind cannot understand what is, if it is distracted, if it is seeking something other than what is, if it is trying to transform what is into something else. Is not our whole education based on that? Are not our religious conceptions and formulae rooted in that? You are this and you must become that, you are greedy and you must become non-greedy, and therefore strive, strain and struggle to become

that. But, if you understood what is, there is no striving. If you are greedy and if you really understood what greed is, then there is no becoming non-greedy. But to understand what greed is you have to give your whole attention, you have to be significantly aware of its extensional values. We won't understand as long as we are striving to change what is into something which is more desirable.

Take a very simple example. If one is stupid and one tries to become clever, can one become clever? You would say `yes', yet can one become clever by passing examinations, by studying and acquiring knowledge and sharpening one's mind? Surely not. That person is still stupid. Greed can never become non-greed. Only when greed, stupidity, etc., cease, is there virtue, intelligence, a state in which there is no greed, no stupidity. Only when I know that I am stupid, will I begin to have intelligence. But, merely to strive after cleverness is not intelligence. Do you need to make an effort in order to understand what is? You make an effort only when you are distracted. Our whole tendency, educationally, spiritually, socially is based on transforming what is into something other than what is. We have spent our days and our energies in transforming what is without understanding what is. Is it not extraordinary, if we look at it in that way? How can you transform anything without understanding what is? To understand what is. surely you must not suppress it, you must not control it, but merely look at it without condemnation or justification. Surely, suppression or discipline do not bring understanding. They only distract from what is. Whereas, if we spent all that energy which we now waste by striving to change what is, in understanding what is, we would find an extraordinary transformation, which is not the

result of effort, but the result of understanding. Understanding comes only when there is no effort, when there is a stillness, and when there is no striving to be other than what is.

Question: What is the difference between introspection and awareness?

Krishnamurti: Introspection begins when there is the desire to change the self. I introspect myself in order to transform, modify, change myself into something. That is why we look into ourselves. I am unhappy and I look into myself to find the cause of unhappiness. To introspect is to look into oneself, to change oneself, to modify oneself according to environmental and religious demands. What happens in that process? In that process there is condemnation. I do not like this and I must become that. I am greedy and I must change to be non-greedy. I am angry and I must become peaceful. By that strife you begin to modify. But the effort becomes tyrannic, does it not? This introspection leads nowhere. Have you tried to become introspective? Is there not a continuity in introspection and therefore a bondage? Every experience is translated according to the pattern of the self, which is always examining, translating, interpreting, putting away things which it does not like and accepting things which it wants. So, introspection is a constant struggle to change what is, whereas awareness is the recognition of what is and therefore the understanding of what is. You cannot recognize or understand something when you condemn it. You can understand only when you are observant, when you are not dissecting or pulling apart to see what is. It is only when you are quiet that what is begins to unfold.

Let us take an example and I hope I can make it clearer. When the man of introspection, is aware that he is greedy, what is his reaction? It is one of condemnation, is it not? Or it may be a denial or a justification. He wants to change it, that is, to change the quality of greed which is painful or pleasant. He either identifies himself with it and therefore pursues it or he denies it and puts it aside. Therefore the reaction is always one of justification, condemnation or identification because he is always translating what is in terms of becoming. This is what we are doing in our daily life, and we are spending our life in this constant transformation of what is, that is, we are striving to be free from greed and still we are greedy, we are confused and weary. After all, the action of a man of introspection is residual, his action springs always from the residue of yesterday, whereas for the man of awareness there is no residual response. He is simply aware, which means, he is not translating, not condemning, not justifying and not identifying himself with anything and therefore his response is non-residual, it is spontaneous. So, there is a great deal of difference between residual response and awareness, the one is a becoming and therefore a constant strife, and the other is being aware of what is and therefore understanding what is and going above and beyond what is, which the introspector can never do.

So, if you really go into it very deeply you will see the extraordinary creative quality of being aware and the destructive quality of introspection. The man of introspection, the introvert, which is unfortunately, a psychoanalytical phrase, is a man who is concerned with changing what is and he can never be creative. He is only concerned with improving himself and he can never be free.



He is only moving within the fortress of his own desires and therefore he can never find reality. He is never happy. Reality will shun him because he is immersed in the idea of becoming righteous. You know that a respectable man, a righteous man, is a curse, which does not mean that the sinner is not also a curse. But at least the sinner is aware and is inquiring and therefore there is a possibility that he will see more than the man who is respectable in his enclosure. Whereas a man of awareness understands directly what is, and in that understanding of what is, there is an extraordinary transformation, an instantaneous transformation, which is creation.

Question: Do you believe in immortality?

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by a belief? Why do you believe and what is there to believe? Do you believe that you are alive? Do you believe that you hear? Does not belief come to be when you are confused, disturbed, anxious and because you need to believe in something to give you a sense of tranquility? Belief then is not what is, and a man who is aware of what is, will never believe. What is there to believe? Surely, when a man believes, his belief is based on some authority which gives him security, certainty, such as the society which provides him with a job, or the organization which gives him a house. For that same reason a man believes in the Master or in his brother because it places him in a safe position. So, belief ensures security and a man who is secure can never find reality, and can never find what is eternal. Only the man who is inquiring, uncertain, anxiously searching, neither accepting nor denying, will find reality. But a man who is resting in his security can never find reality and because belief makes a

man secure, it not only binds him but destroys his creative thinking.

What do we mean by immortality? We will perhaps understand it if we can understand what is continuity. If we can understand death perhaps we shall be able to understand immortality. If we can understand the ending of things, then we shall be able to understand that which is imperishable, immortal. And therefore to understand the immortal, the imperishable, we have to understand the ending which we call death. We say we understand death because we see a dead body. Surely that is not death. Death is the unknown, is it not? As reality, the imperishable, is the unknown, so death is the unknown and you do not know it. But you have searched for years, for centuries and given all your thoughts to truth which is also the unknown but you have avoided thinking about death. Why is that? I think, there is the problem, if we can understand it. Death, the unknown, you have shunned and put away, and you have pursued reality, you have pursued and you have written volumes about God; every temple has an image of Him or inscriptions about Him. By your thoughts you have given life to things. Why have we pursued reality, God, the Truth, the unknown? You do not know it. If you knew it the world would be different and we would love one another. Why do you shun one and accept the other? You shun death because you fear the cessation of continuity and pursue immortality because you want continuity. So you invest in God, not knowing what you are investing in. Is this not very odd? And after investing in God you ask, is there immortality, because you want insurance, a further guarantee and the man who assures you of immortality, will gratify

you and you will be pleased.

Surely the problem is not whether there is immortality or whether there is not. If I tell you there is, what difference will it make? Will you transform your life tomorrow? Certainly not. If I tell you there is not, you will go to someone else who will assure you there is. So you are between the believer and the non-believer and it gives you pain. And to understand anxiety or fear of death, you must find out why there is this division between reality and death; why you pursue ceaselessly, generation after generation what you call God not knowing what it is and always avoiding the thought of death. Has there been a sacred book about death? No there have always been books and books on God.

If you know God as an idea or as a formula it cannot be real. Surely the unknown can never be translated into things. The real cannot be explained to him who does not know it. There is immediate communication between two persons who love each other. You can write poems about love, volumes and volumes about it, but you cannot communicate it to another if he does not know it. Similarly, it seems to me futile to inquire whether there is God, because if you search rightly you will find out if there is or if there is not. Similarly if you search rightly you will find out the significance of death. We seek continuity through property, through family, or through beliefs or ideation and as long as we are assured of continuity there is no fear. So the man who is seeking psychological continuity invests in property and when he realizes its impermanency, he seeks other forms of continuity, psychological continuity in the nation, in the race and if that is denied to him, then in belief of the ultimate continuity in God, the

unknown, and when that assurance is threatened he calls it death of which he is afraid. So, we are not really concerned with reality or God or death, we are concerned with continuity which we call by a lovely word 'immortality.' You only want continuity in some form or another, to be given to you by a name, by the family, by the priest, by the book, by tradition, by the temple.

What happens to anything that continues? It decays, or it becomes a routine and therefore merely functions as a machine. Continuity is a guarantee of decay, but the moment you think you will cease to continue you become afraid. If you are aware of that fear you will see that the fear ceases. Only then will you be able to understand that there is no division between death and life because death and reality are the unknown, but a mind that is moving, that has its being in the known can never find the unknown. The known is always the continuous and the mind clings to the known and gives life to the known, and therefore it is always moving within the house of the known and it is that known which wants to be continued. Surely that which is known is already in the net of time. It can never know the unknowable and it is only when the mind is freed from the net of time that there is the timeless. Then only there is a life that is not thought in terms of time or continuity. To understand death there must be no fear. But a man who desires continuity is frightened and the escapes that civilization has created to allay his fear have so drugged him, made him so dull, that he cannot see the significance of death. Surely death is as lovely as the real is, because both are the unknown, but a mind that is merely functioning within the known can never understand the unknown. Question: Please explain further what you mean by the clarification

of the conscious?

Krishnamurti: I said in my talk last Sunday that the superficial consciousness must clarify itself and be clear, for the hidden to project itself - the hidden motives, unconscious and subconscious hidden demands, pursuits, ignorance and darkness, the hidden being not the real. That is, if we would understand anything, the immediate mind must be calm. What generally happens when you have a problem is that you think about it, worry over it like a dog worries a bone, you take it, tear it, look at it from different angles and at the end of the day you are tired of the problem and you go to bed, worn out by your struggle to comprehend and to find a solution. When you go to bed and when you sleep your conscious mind is relaxed because having thought a great deal you cannot think any more. Being relaxed, when you wake up in the morning you see the answer.

There is a phrase, 'go and sleep over a problem for the answer.' What happens is that your conscious mind, not understanding the problem puts it aside and having detached itself from it, has become clarified; and the unconscious or the deeper layers begin to project themselves into the conscious and when you wake up, the problem has been very simply solved. So, similarly the conscious mind, the upper layers of consciousness must be clarified so that the mind can always be tranquil, so that it can receive intimations or hints from the hidden. But we are not tranquil. Our conscious mind is incessantly restless, moving from problem to problem, from one desire to another, from one demand to another, from one distraction to another and from one attraction to another. Have you not noticed that the superficial layer is never still? It is always

battling and striving, being very cunning in business, in law, cunning with God, with everything, it is so alive, so alert with knowledge and with education. So, how can such a mind be receptive? Surely, Sir, a room is useful only when it is empty and a conscious mind that is not empty is really a useless mind, it is no good for anything except modern civilization which is so utterly degraded and degenerated, because it is the product of the upper layer. The upper layer is mechanical, swift and cunning, ever safeguarding itself. Is not the modern civilization only mechanical and industrial, even though the upper layer may talk about beauty and the dance, and invest a great deal of money in education, in painting, in discussing the true dance, the unknown dance, the modern dance and so on? And if the upper layer of consciousness is not still, how can it be receptive, how can it receive intimations of things hidden, of things unknown?

So the problem then is how to make the upper layer of the mind, that superficial layer of consciousness, act. But is that not a wrong question to put to oneself? Because, to make the superficial consciousness act is only another form of activity. 'How' immediately becomes the problem and therefore you are back again where you were. What is important is to be aware of what is, aware that the superficial mind is restless, without denying or justifying it; aware of all its destructiveness and all its cleverness and its substitutions. And you will see that by being, not becoming, aware of it, the superficial consciousness becomes free to act.

When you are interested in something you listen to it. You are observing now the picture which I am painting and therefore the superficial layer is very quiet. If there is any distraction, your

listening becomes merely a distraction. So the difficulty lies not in making the superficial consciousness which you call mind quiet but in being aware of all the extraordinary and rapid activities of the mind. To slow it down is very difficult and you can do it only if every thought is followed through fully, without fear and without condemnation. As long as the conscious mind, the superficial layer, is agitated, restless, demanding, seeking, striving and translating, it cannot understand and it is only in the clarity of the upper layers of consciousness that it can receive intimations of the hidden.

Question: You have realized reality. Can you tell us what God is? Krishnamurti: Sirs, how do you know that I have realized? To know that I have realized, you also must have realized. This is not just a clever answer. To know something you must be of it. You must yourself have had the experience also and therefore your saying that I have realized has apparently no meaning. And what does it matter if I have realized or have not realized? Is not what I am saying the truth? Even if I am the most perfect human being if what I say is not the truth why would you even listen to me? Surely, my realization has nothing whatever to do with what I am saying and the man who worships another because that other has realized is really worshipping authority and therefore he can never find the truth. And to understand what has been realized and to know him who has realized, is not at all important. Is it? I know the whole tradition says 'be with a man who has realised.' How can you know that he has realized? All that you can do is to keep company with him, which is extremely difficult nowadays. There are very few good people, in the real sense of the word 'good,' who are not seeking something, who are not after something. Those

who are seeking something or are after something are exploiters and therefore it is very difficult for anyone to find a companion to love. We idealize those who have realized and hope that they will give us something which is again a false relationship.

How can the man who has realized, communicate, if there is no love? That is our difficulty. In all our discussions we do not really love each other and we are suspicious. You want something from me, knowledge, realization, or you want to keep company with me all of which indicates that you do not love. You want something and therefore you are out to exploit. If we really love each other then there will be instantaneous communication. Then it does not matter if you have realized and I have not, or you are the high or the low. And since our heart has withered, God has become awfully important. That is, you want to know God because you have lost the song in your heart and you pursue the singer and ask him whether he can teach you how to sing. He can teach you the technique but the technique will not lead you to creation. You cannot be a musician by merely knowing how to sing. You may know all the steps of a dance but if you have not creation in your heart you are only functioning as a machine. You cannot love if your object is merely to achieve a result. There is no such thing as an ideal because that is merely an achievement. Beauty is not an achievement, it is reality, now, not tomorrow, and if there is love you will understand the unknown, you will know what God is, and nobody need tell you and that is the beauty of love. It is eternity in itself. And because we have no love we want someone else like God to give us that. If we really loved, not an ideal, do you know what a different world this would be? We would be really happy



people. Therefore we would not invest our happiness in things, in family, in ideals. We would be happy and therefore things, family and ideals will not dominate our lives. They are all secondary things. Because we do not love and because we are not happy we invest in things, thinking that they will give us happiness and one of the things in which we invest is God.

Now, you want me to tell you what reality is. Can the indescribable be put in words? Can you measure something immeasurable? Can you catch the wind in your fist? If you do, is that the wind? If you measure that which is the immeasurable, is that the real? If you formulate it, is that the real? Surely not, for the moment you describe something which is indescribable, it ceases to be the real. The moment you translate the unknowable into the known it ceases to be the unknowable and yet that is what we are hankering after. Every moment we want to know because then we will be able to continue, then we will be able to have ultimate permanency and happiness. We want to know because we are not happy, because we are striving miserably, because we are worn out and degraded; yet instead of realizing the simple fact that we are degraded, that we are dull, that we are weary, that everything is in turmoil, we want to move away from what is known into the known. That which is emphasized is still the known and therefore we can never find the real. Therefore, instead of asking who has realized, or what God is, why not give your whole attention and awareness to what is? Then you will find the unknown, or rather, it will come to you. If you understood what is known, you would experience that extraordinary silence, not induced, not enforced, that silence which is extraordinarily creative, that creative

emptiness in which alone reality can enter. It cannot come to that which is becoming, which is striving, it can only come to that which is being, which understands what is. Then you will see that reality is not in the distance, the unknown is not far off, it is in what is. As the answer to a problem is in the problem, so reality is in what is, and if we can understand it then we shall know truth. But it is extremely difficult to be aware of dullness, to be aware of greed, to be aware of ill will, ambition and so on. And the very fact of being aware of what is, is truth. It is truth that liberates, not your striving to be free. So, reality is not far, but we place it far away because we use it as a means to self-continuity. It is here, now, in the immediate. The eternal or the timeless is now and the now cannot be understood by a man who is caught in the net of time. To free thought from time demands action because the mind is lazy, it is slothful and therefore ever creates other hindrances. It is only possible by right meditation, which means complete action,-not a continuous action, and complete action can only be understood when the mind understands the process of continuity, which is memory, not the factual, but the psychological memory and as long as memory functions, the mind cannot understand what is. And one's mind, one's whole being, becomes extraordinarily creative, passively alert when we understand the significance of ending, because in ending there is renewal while in continuity there is death, there is decay.

November 23, 1947.

## MADRAS 7TH PUBLIC TALK 30TH NOVEMBER, 1947

I have talked a little about right relationship between yourself and myself, but I would like to go further into that matter. It seems to me that the attitude as between a teacher and a pupil is a wrong attitude. We can well understand a pupil going to a technician to learn engineering or the art of painting, dancing or music. But is that our relationship here? Are you actually learning anything from me? Or, are we trying together to unwrap something which is life, which is our every day existence, in which there is so much pain, so much strife and so much misery? Do we learn anything at all? Apart from technical subjects, do we learn anything, or does understanding come in spontaneously and freely? Is understanding the result of accumulation? You may have read a great many books, all the sacred literature, psychological, philosophical and other kinds of books. Do you gather understanding from books? Is not knowledge different from understanding and does the mere accumulation of knowledge yield understanding? So we ought to establish between ourselves the right relationship.

I talk about it at every meeting and at every discussion we have, because it seems very important to me to establish the right communication between ourselves. The moment you approach another with the attitude of getting something profitable out of him, either financially or spiritually, surely you will cut off all communication. Does the false respect that we show, indicate understanding? You show me respect sometimes but most of the time for your servants and wives and neighbours there is contempt,

disrespect, indifference, or callousness. So what is important? To show respect to a man who you think has something to give you and to be contemptuous, hard and brutal to others? And does learning constitute the whole of existence? If it did, we would certainly misinterpret existence. But if we can understand from moment to moment the whole significance of existence, then perhaps there will be joy, there will be happiness. But if you are out merely to learn, to accumulate, through which accumulation you translate further experience, then life becomes a series of monotonous tragedies, despair, ugliness and darkness. Then you are concerned merely with accumulating, and acquiring a standard by which to live. Surely you do not call that living?

As it is, our existence is pretty awful and merely to understand verbally what is being said and use it as a pattern to translate everyday existence will not bring about understanding. Understanding comes when there is no effort, when there is a freshness. When you suddenly see something, is that because of accumulation of learning or of acquisition? Surely not. It comes in freedom. So we ought to establish right relationship not only between ourselves but also in our daily existence. Then we will see how extraordinarily swift life is and also how painful it is, and how our existence leads us nowhere. So, to understand the whole purpose of existence we must understand effort, because life or existence is sorrowful as we know it. There is nothing joyous. We are not happy people. Look at the strain, the turmoil that we go through. We are always in strife, we are always in struggle, there is never a moment's deep happiness when we can say 'we are happy'. Do we know such moments? We are in constant battle with

ourselves and with our neighbours. We are hedged in and bound and our whole existence is a strife; and as it is a constant effort, a constant battle, what is it all meant for? And as we do not know happiness, except at rare intervals, we have completely forgotten it. We do have rare happy moments when our everyday strife, struggle and phenomena stop, but we do not know how to sustain it. It seems to me that until we know how, our life will have no meaning.

I think we will understand the significance of life if we understood what it means to make an effort. Does happiness come through effort? Have you ever tried to be happy? It is impossible, is it not? You struggle to be happy and there is no happiness. Is there? Joy does not come through suppression, through control or indulgence. You may indulge, but there is bitterness at the end. You may suppress or control but there is always strife in the hidden. So, happiness does not come through effort, nor joy through control and suppression and still all our life is a series of suppressions, series of controls, a series of regretful indulgences. Also there is a constant overcoming, a constant struggle with our passions, our greed and our stupidity. So is not the strife, the struggle, the effort that we make, in the hope of finding happiness, finding something which will give us a feeling of peace, a sense of love? Yet, does love or understanding come by strife? So, I think it is very important to understand what we mean by struggle, strife or effort.

First we must be free to see that joy and happiness do not come through effort. Is creation through effort or is there creation only with the cessation of effort? When do you write, paint or sing?

When do you create? Surely when there is no effort, when you are completely open, when on all levels you are in complete communication, completely integrated. Then there is joy and then you begin to sing, or write a poem or paint or make a form. The moment of creation is not born of struggle.

So, we must very clearly understand this whole problem of struggle and strife. I know there are many, many ramifications, many different sides to it. But if we can understand the core of the problem of effort and its significance, then we can translate that into our daily life. But, if you merely approach the central issue through the part, I am afraid you will not understand the significance of effort. Does not effort mean a struggle to change `what is' into what it is not, or into what it should be or should become? That is, we are constantly struggling to avoid facing `what is', or we are trying to get away from it or to transform or modify `what is'. A man who is truly content is the man who understands `what is', gives the right significance to `what is'. That is true contentment; it is not concerned with having few or many possessions, but with the understanding of the whole significance of `what is' and that can only come when you recognize what is, when you are aware of it, not when you are trying to modify it or change it.

So, effort is a strife or a struggle to transform that which is into something which you wish it to be. I am only talking about psychological struggle, not the struggle with a physical problem like engineering or some discovery or transformation which is purely technical. I am talking only of that struggle which is psychological and which always overcomes the technical. You

may build with great care a marvellous society, using the infinite knowledge science has given us. But as long as the psychological strife and struggle and battle are not understood, and the psychological overtones and currents are not overcome, the structure of society, however marvellously built is bound to crash, as has happened over and over again.

So, effort is a distraction from `what is'. Sirs, if I may suggest, think it over and you will see. The moment I accept `what is' there is no struggle. Any form of struggle or strife is an indication of distraction and distraction which is effort must exist as long as psychologically I wish to transform `what is' into something it is not. Take for example `anger'. Can anger be overcome by effort, by various methods and techniques, by meditations and various forms of transforming `what is' into what is not? Now, suppose that instead of making an effort to transform anger into non-anger, you accepted or acknowledged that you are angry, what would happen then? You would be aware that you are angry, What would happen? Would you indulge in anger? Please follow what I am talking about and you will see. If you are aware that you are angry, which is `what is', and knowing the stupidity of transforming `what is, into what is not, would you still be angry? If instead of trying to overcome anger, modifying or changing it, you accepted it and looked at it, if you were completely aware of it, without condemning or justifying it, there would be an instantaneous change. But this is extremely difficult because our whole tendency is to transform or deny. We deny ugliness thinking that we shall achieve beauty.

Surely virtue is not the denial of vice; virtue is only the

recognition of vice. The moment I know that I am angry and I do not try to transform my anger I cease to be angry. You try it, you experiment with yourself and you will see how extraordinary it is, how extraordinary is the creative quality of understanding 'what is'. Similarly there cannot be freedom if there is no virtue.

As I said last Sunday the stupid man is an unvirtuous man. He is disorderly. He creates havoc in society, not because he is unvirtuous but because he is stupid and to be virtuous requires the highest form of intelligence; to bring order within yourself requires an extraordinary capacity to see things as they are. When you recognize the false as false there is freedom. That is, freedom can only be approached negatively, not positively and to see the false is to see the true and there can only be freedom in virtue, in understanding, and not in becoming which is but the transforming of 'what is' into something else. This is the process of becoming: 'I will become this or that today or ten lives from now', 'I will become a pupil in my next life', 'I will be virtuous the day after tomorrow', and so on. Surely all such ways of thinking are indicative of real stupidity, because they imply transforming 'what is' into something it is not. Surely you cannot make 'anger' into 'non-anger'. If you understand anger, that is, if you are aware of it fully, without condemnation, justification or identification, just aware that you are angry, that you are jealous, that you are greedy, that you are full of ill will, then you will see an extraordinary thing taking place; your anger or jealousy drops away. It drops away spontaneously. It is only when we are not aware of exactly 'what is', that we make the effort to transform it.

So, effort is non-awareness. The moment you are aware, which



is neither to condemn nor justify, the moment you accept, look and observe what is, there is no effort; then the thing that you observe, that which is, that which you are aware of, has an extraordinary significance. If you pursue that significance through, you complete that thought and therefore the mind is freed from it. So, awareness is non-effort, awareness is to perceive the thing as it is without distortion. Distortion exists whenever there is effort. When you love completely, every thought comes with such joy, clarity and happiness. This can only happen when there is integration and when there is no effort. Maturity or integration can only come when there is complete awareness of 'what is'.

Many questions have been sent to me. As I said before, you can ask innumerable questions, but you will not have the right answer if the questioner himself is not in earnest. As I leave, you give me your questions in writing or ask them verbally but I am afraid most of you are not aware of what you are asking. To find the right answer to a question we must study the problem, not merely wait for an answer. Life is not a series of conclusions, of 'yes' or 'no'. Life is a series of responses and challenges and it depends on you how you respond. To know how to respond requires immense study; immense self-knowledge gained not through tricks, not through gurus, but by yourself in your every day action and thought. My answers are only indications towards self-revelation. If you wait for a conclusion or an assertion from me you are going to be disappointed. But if together we study the problem, we will see and understand its many implications. So, please bear in mind that in answering these questions I am not offering you any conclusions, because that which is concluded is not the truth. Life

is movement, not continuity, and if we seek a conclusion or an answer, `yes' or `no' we are making life very small; and we want `yes' or `no' because our minds are small. If we recognize with our minds our smallness we can then proceed.

Question: I am very seriously disturbed by the sex urge. How am I to overcome it?

Krishnamurti: Sirs, this is an enormous problem. The implications are extraordinarily profound and wide. There are many, many things involved in this question, not merely sex, which is only of secondary importance. So, please bear with me if I do not tell you how to overcome the sex urge; but we are going to study the problem together, to see what is involved and as we study the problem, you will find the right answer for yourself. First, let us understand the problem of overcoming. How am I to overcome anger, jealousy? What happens when you overcome an enemy? It is always possible to overcome him. I may overcome you because I am stronger, but you may be stronger presently and you will overcome me. So, it is a game of constantly overcoming. That which can be overcome has to be overcome or conquered over and over again. Please see the significance of that simple statement. Whereas if you understand something, it is over. Take the wars that have been going on in Europe, the overcoming of one country by another; they have been doing that for the past two thousand years all over the world. But, if they had said `let us sit down and understand and not fight and kill each other', surely there would have been an understanding of peace.

So, there is overcoming, but understanding is much more difficult than conquering, than controlling, because understanding

requires thought, wise observation, examination and tentative approach, which means intelligence. A stupid man can always overcome something. The advice that you must strive and overcome is a real folly, which does not mean that you must give in, indulge, which is the opposite and therefore equally foolish, if there is a problem, as the questioner has, of sex, we must understand it and not merely ask: how can it be overcome? That which has been overcome has to be conquered and reconquered again and again. Have you ever conquered? Did you not have to repeat it over and over again because it reappeared in ten other ways? So, surely that is not the way to understand the problem. Where there is a justification of overcoming, where there is condemnation or identification, surely there can be no understanding. You will have understanding only when you consider the problem, when you accept it, look at it, become aware of its significance completely, and even love it. Then it will yield you its significance. Then, in it there is creativeness.

Because all our pleasures are mechanical, sex has become the only pleasure which is creative. Religion has become mechanical. Authority has bound us mentally and emotionally and therefore you are blinded and blocked there. There is no creativeness in thinking about God. Is there? You do not find joy in thinking about God? It gives you emotional satisfaction. One has to be happy and joyous, which is surely the highest form of religion. But merely following authority, tradition, going to the temple, repeating mantrams, attending to the priests, surely that is not religion. That is mere repetition and what happens if you repeat? Your mind becomes dull, there is no joy in it. So emotionally and

intellectually we are starved. We are merely repeating. This is a fact. I am not saying something extraordinary. Emotionally we are machines carrying out a routine and the machine is not creative. A man may have habits but thereby he is not creative. He may recite mantrams, practise japams and all the rest of that nonsense, but he is not creative. Such a repetitive man has merely destroyed his clarity, the power to think, the power to perceive, to understand.

See what society has done to us - our education, our routine of business, the gathering of money, the performing of awful duties and so on. In all this, is there a sense of joy? There is only perfect boredom. So, as we are hedged all-round by uncreative thinking, there is only one thing left to us, and that is sex. As sex is the only thing that is left, it becomes an enormous problem, whereas if we understood what it means to be creative religiously and emotionally, to be creative at all moments, when you love, when you cry; when you are aware of that directly, surely then sex would become an insignificant problem.

But you see the difficulties. Passion or the biological urge is so strong, that religious societies through their tradition and laws have held you in restraint, but now that tradition and laws have little significance, you merely indulge in it.

Another enormous thing which we have lost through this struggle and through this regimentation, is love. Love is chaste and without love merely to overcome or indulge in sex has no meaning. Without love, we have become what we are today, mere machines. If we look at our faces in the mirror we can see how unformed they are, how immature we are. We have produced children without love. Often we are emotionally driven without

love and what kind of civilization do you expect to produce in that way? I know the religious books say that you must become a Brahmacharya to find God. Do you mean to say that you can find God without love? Brahmacharya is merely an idea, an ideal to be achieved. Surely that which you achieve through will, through condemnation, through conclusion will not lead you to reality, to God. What shows us the way to reality, to God, is understanding and not suppression, not substitution. To give up sex for the love of God, is only substitution, only sublimation, it is not understanding. So, if there is love there is chastity; but to become chaste is to become ugly, vicious and immature.

So, look at our lives and see what we have done. We do not know how to love. Our life is merely an aspiring for position, for the continuance of ourselves through our families, through our sons and so on. But without love what is our life? Surely, mere suppression of passion does not solve anything, neither the brutal sex passion, nor the passion to become something. Surely they are both the same. You may suppress sex, but if you are ambitious to be something it is the same urge in another direction. It is equally brutal, equally vicious, equally ugly. But a man who has real love in his heart has no sorrow and to him sex is not a problem. But since we have lost love, sex has become a great problem and a difficult one because we are caught in it, by habit, by imagination and by yesterday's memory which threatens us and holds us. And why are we held by yesterday's memory? Again, because we are not creative human beings. Creation is constant renewal. That which was yesterday will never be again. There can only be today; not memory to which you give life. Memory is not creation,

memory is not life. Memory does not give understanding, yet we hold on to it, to all the excitements of sex through memory. That gives us an extraordinary exhilaration, for that is the only thing we have. We are starved, empty; and the only thing we think of is to repeat, to recollect. What happens to a thing that is repeated over and over again? It becomes mechanical. There is no joy in it, and there is no creation.

We are hedged in by fear, by anxiety, by the desire for security; but in order to understand this problem we must look at it from every side, consider all its aspects through the everyday excitements in newspapers and cinemas, the search for pleasure and all the luxuries, the sins, the half - hints, the education that we receive, which stifles all thinking, which prepares us to become something, which is the height of stupidity. We become lawyers, glorified clerks, but this education does not give us the culture of integration, the joy in living. We do not know how to look at a tree, we merely talk about it. And religiously, what are you? You go to the temple, you perform all the ceremonies and rituals. What are they? They are mere repetitions, vain repetitions. And our politics are mere gossip, cunning deceptions. Our whole existence being all that, how can there be creation for a man who is blind? How can he see? Surely he could see if he would throw off all the rotten rubbish around him. It would be like a storm that comes and sweeps away things that are not firm, and from that freedom there would be creation. But not only do we not want freedom, we do not want revolution either - I am not talking about political or outward revolution - we do not want the inward revolution. We prefer to go on with this monotonous uncreative existence. We are

afraid of what we might find.

So, the problem can only be solved in understanding ourselves and the utterly uncreative state we live in; and it is only through self-knowledge that creation can come into being, and that creation is reality or God, or whatever you may call it. It cannot come into being through repetition, through pleasurable habits, either religious or sexual. To understand ourselves is extremely arduous. If you go into this problem and become aware of its significance you will see what it reveals and that is what I have just now shown - a series of imitations, a series of habits, a series of clouds, and memories. This is what this question reveals, whether you like it or not. It is a fact, that occasionally a break in the clouds through which you see. But most of the time we are enclosed in our own cravings, wants and fears and naturally the only outlet is sex, which degenerates, enervates and becomes a problem. So, while looking at this problem, we begin to discover our own state, that is, 'what is', not how to transform it, but how to be aware of it. Do not condemn it, do not try to sublimate it or find substitutions, or overcome it. Be simply aware of it, of all it means; your going to the temple, your sacred thread, your repetition, your family and so on. See how monotonous, how uncreative all of it is; how stupid it is. These are facts and you must be aware of them. Then you will feel a new breath, a new consciousness and the moment you recognize 'what is', there is an instantaneous transformation; seeing the false as false is the beginning of wisdom but we cannot see the false if we are not aware of every moment of the day, of everything we say, feel and think, and you will see that out of that awareness comes that extraordinary thing called love and a man who loves is

chaste, a man who loves is pure and knows life.

Question: What are your views about the implications of the belief in reincarnation?

Krishnamurti: Again, this is a vast subject. Again, as a means of self-discovery we will examine the problem; not to find a 'yes' or 'no' answer but as a means of understanding ourselves. There is so much to say and I must be brief. I can only give hints, point out certain significances, I cannot go into the whole problem, because it is immense. I do not know whether you see it in the same way I do. First of all, let us put aside the superficial responses and reactions to this question, one of which is that the person who wants a good time does not bother about reincarnation, about life after death. The person has a good time anyway, which means that he is not afraid to act as he pleases or else he is so stupid that he feels no responsibility for his actions. After all if you have to pay for your actions you are going to be very careful. If, in the business world, you know a mistake will make you lose, whether a small or a large amount, you will be very, very careful. So, fear has been used as a means to control man; that is what religions have done, what society does through its code of morality. For the moment we are not concerned with that aspect of the question. Neither are we concerned with belief, because belief, to a man who is seeking truth, has no significance whatever, as belief is merely a security, an anchorage, a haven. A man who seeks truth must travel the uncharted seas; he has no harbours, he has no havens, he must go out to explore. So, we can put aside also this aspect of the problem.

Two things are implied in this question: continuation, and cause and effect. With regard to continuation, we must consider the idea



that there is in each one of us a spiritual essence which continues. Now let us examine that idea. First, it is said in books and you also feel that there is a spiritual structure which continues after death. Please do not be on the defensive; I want to find out the truth about it. To accept an authority is to stop all thinking process. So, we are not going to accept what the sacred books say nor what you feel because after all what you feel is based on your desire for security. Now, is there a spiritual essence in man? Please consider the implications. All that is spiritual is in essence timeless, it is eternal. Surely, if that is so, the timeless, the eternal is beyond birth and death it is beyond time and space. So, you need not worry about things that are beyond time. It is not your concern. If it is timeless, if it is eternal, it is birthless and deathless, it has no time. If it has no time, it means there is no continuity; then why do you hold on to it? If it is timeless, it would not be continuous. But to you it is of time, because you cling to it. Therefore, it is not timeless.

Therefore it is not spiritual in essence; because you have created it, therefore you cling to it. If it were real, it would be beyond your control. If it is true, you do not know it and, as I said before, if you know it, it is not true, and yet you cling to it. You say that there is a spiritual essence, which is the I, and that it continues, and at the same time you say it is timeless. So you have to understand the problem of continuity, which implies death, in order to know whether there is a spiritual entity or not. You have to understand death, which means you have to understand the whole problem of continuity. What continues in our everyday life? Memory through your own continuity, through your family, your belief; and as we seek continuity, psychological and physiological, we are afraid of

death. Therefore, we want continuity. If continuity of this physical existence is denied us, we seek continuity in what we call 'God.' Therefore, when we talk of reincarnation, we actually seek continuity.

Now, what is it that continues? You, that is, your thinking, your memories, your day to day experiences. I identify myself with my memories, my property, my family, my beliefs and I continue and I want to be sure that that which continues, goes on. Therefore, I do not want to die, yet I know that I am going to die. So, how can I find continuity? Therefore, my problem is not to discover the truth about reincarnation, but to ensure my continuity. What is it which we say continues? What is that to which we hold on so desperately, so fearfully, so anxiously? Are they not memories? Sirs, remove your memories, and where are you? And those memories are given life by constant accumulation and by constant recollection.

Memory in itself has no substance, no vitality. The moment I say 'I remember' I am identifying myself with the past. That is, as long as a man who is the result of the past, is concerned with the results of the past, there must be continuity. And what happens to that which continues. Nothing, for it is only a habit. Habit is the only thing that can continue, and to which you give life from time to time. So, the thing which continues is memory, a dead thing to which you give life, which means that through a series of habits, accumulations and idiosyncrasies, the experiences are translated to produce all that you wish to have continued. Moreover, that which continues decays. That which is continuous is non-creative.

So, this is what is principally involved in the question of reincarnation and this is the truth of it; not what a man says about it

that it is a fact. If we really go into it, if we are aware of its significance, we will find that, that which is spiritual is timeless and therefore beyond our reach and therefore beyond continuity; for continuity is time - yesterday, today and tomorrow. And the more we cling to that spiritual essence, the more we are really distracted from it by false action, because the timeless cannot be known by the known. You talk about the spiritual essence, which is the I, therefore you must know it, therefore it is not the truth. I am not describing something which is not. Memory by itself is a dead thing. We give it life because it gratifies us. But where there is gratification there must be continuity, and gratification soon ends, but we revive it in another form, and so we keep going. And what is continuous is not immortal, what is continuous does not renew itself. It merely continues as a habit. It is only in renewal that there is creation, there is reality; but only in ending there is renewal, not in continuity. See the trees, they drop their leaves and fresh leaves come. They do not continue. Because we are afraid, we cling to our memories and a man who is living as a continuity is a dead man and I am afraid that is what we are doing.

In this question there is also the problem of cause and effect. Are cause and effect two separate things or are they interrelated? The effect becomes the cause. So, there is never a moment which is alone either effect or cause. So, cause and effect are completely interrelated. They are not two separate processes; they are one because the effect has become the cause, and what was cause has become effect; but when we view cause apart from effect, there is an illusory time interval which leads us to the wrong conclusion and on this wrong conclusion all your philosophies are based. The

cause passing through time becomes modified. The moment there is an effect, the cause cannot be in the distance. They are together although you may take time to perceive it. But the effect is where the cause is, that is, the moment you are aware of 'what is,' which is the cause, the effect is also there. Therefore there is transformation. Please think over the implications and the real beauty of this. It means that if you understand 'what is' there is immediate transformation. Therefore, there is a timeless change, not a change in time. We have been trained to believe, and we expect to change, in time, to become something tomorrow. But if you perceive the cause becoming the effect all the time and the effect becoming the cause all the time, then there is immediate understanding, therefore immediate 'cessation' of cause. That is, Sirs, to make it very simple, when you are angry, instead of saying that you will do something about it tomorrow, if you would see immediately the cause of anger and recognize it, be aware of it, there would be immediate transformation, because then you are free from this idea, this illusion, this wrong way of thinking that only in time you can produce a result. The cause is in the effect. The end is in the means and so when we consider reincarnation we can consider it from both points of view, that of the believer and that of the non-believer, for both are caught in their beliefs, in their stupidity, and are therefore incapable of finding what is true. We must regard the problem as it is to ourselves. In being aware of this problem we see how marvellous a thing is self-knowledge, which is the beginning of wisdom. Self-knowledge, or seeing what is false in the I, is the beginning of intelligence; being aware of the stupid ways of thinking, is the beginning of understanding.

Question: From your talks it seems clear that reason is the chief means to acquire self-knowledge. Is this so?

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by reason? Can reason be separated from feeling? You have done it, because you have developed the intellect and nothing else. It is like a three-legged object, one leg of which is much longer than the others and therefore it cannot stay balanced. That is what has happened to us. We are highly intellectual. We are trained to be such. Our education, our way of life is geared to intellectual capacity in the highest degree. And we have used intellect as a means of finding reality. The books you read, the practices you follow, everything you do helps you to develop the intellect and therefore reason has become extraordinarily important in your life, in your devices and your actions. But intellect is only a part, not the whole. To understand reality and to reason are two different things. Without reason - at least what I mean by reason - we cannot live. Reason is balance, integration. Reason must understand reason to find reality. But reason as we know it now, is intellection and it can never yield anything but disruption, as is being seen all over the world just because the world worships intellect. Intellect is producing such havoc, degradation and misery, but that is not reason, it is merely intellectuality concerned only with the superficial, responding to the immediate challenge. But there is a reason which is integration, maturity, which is completeness. Reason must go beyond itself to find reality. To put it differently, as long as there is thinking there cannot be the real, because thinking is the product of the past, thinking is of time, the response to time, therefore thinking can never be the timeless. Thinking must come to an end. Then only

can the timeless be. But the thinking process cannot be violated, suppressed, disciplined; the mind must understand itself as being the result of emotions, of memory, of the past. The mind must be aware of itself and its activities. When the mind is aware of its being, you will find that there comes an extraordinary silence, a stillness, when that which is the result of the past no longer functions, in conjunction with the present. Then there is only silence, not a hypnotic silence, but the silence which is stillness. It is in this state that creativeness can take place, and it is the real. To find this stillness, reason must transcend itself. Mere intellectuality which has no significance, has nothing to do with reality and a man who is merely logical, reasonable, who uses intellect very carefully, can never find that which is. A man who is integrated has a different kind of reasoning process, which is intelligence yet even his intelligence, his reasoning must transcend itself. Then there is stillness which is happiness, which is ecstasy.

November 30, 1947

## **MADRAS 8TH PUBLIC TALK 7TH DECEMBER, 1947**

Before I answer the many questions that have been put to me I would like to make one or two remarks. First, I wish to make a very brief resume of what I have been saying, and then I would like to suggest how the answers to the questions should be received.

It seems to me that it would be a really beautiful world, if there were no teachers and no disciples. I wonder if you have ever considered why there come to be teachers and disciples; why we look to another for enlightenment, for encouragement, for guidance? Would it not be a peaceful and orderly world, if there were neither the seeker nor the thing which he seeks? The thing which he seeks originates, does it not, from a desire for gain and therefore out of this desire comes conflict. As long as one desires to profit, whether spiritually or materially, there is conflict between man and man and if we can understand the significance of this idea of gain, perhaps, we shall find real peace, and thereby abolish the division between the teacher and the disciple and the extraordinary fear that exists between the disciple and the master though the disciple calls it love. We are caught in the process of acquisition and we realize its painful nature and so we wish to get out of that process and this gives birth to duality, does it not? That is, I want to gain and the desire to gain entails always fear and fear naturally creates duality and then the conflict of the opposites begins.

Now, does not one opposite contain the germ of its own opposite? That is, if virtue is the opposite of vice, is it virtue? I do not know if you have thought along these lines, but if you observe

you will find that any opposite always contains its own opposite, that is, if vice is the opposite of virtue, virtue contains vice and therefore virtue is not the opposite of vice and so if we can understand this conflict the opposite ceases. I think it is very important to understand this point because most of us are caught in this problem of opposites, greed and non - greed, ignorance and knowledge and so on, and being caught in it, what must one do? The problem then is how to overcome it. Now, is there a problem at all or have we merely misunderstood the conflict altogether? That is, if we can understand the fact itself, anger for instance, then the conflict of its opposite ceases; that is, if we can understand `what is', the problem of duality in which is implied the existence of evil, ceases. I think it is of the utmost importance to understand this problem of opposites as it exists in our daily life; is there ever any way out of the opposites or is the only way through the understanding of the fact itself, without any attempt to overcome it by its opposite? In other words, `what is' can only be understood through awareness, not through condemnation or justification; it is important to understand fear itself and not try to escape into its opposite and thereby create the conflict of the opposites.

I am not going further into this problem now because I have many questions to answer; but, I want to point out the difficulty of understanding ourselves, of being aware through self-knowledge, of what you are thinking, what you are feeling and what you are doing. If we do not understand the dual process of our own activities, our own feelings and thoughts, we have no basis for right thinking.

To be aware of ourselves is extremely arduous. It does not



require book knowledge. To know ourselves is to reach the source of wisdom and this is not mere hearsay nor mere assertion. If you begin to inquire, to be aware choicelessly of yourself in everything that you do, you will soon discover what extraordinary depths thought can plumb and how free this awareness is.

Question: You have often talked of relationship. What does it mean to you?

Krishnamurti: First of all there is no such thing as being isolated. There is no existence in isolation. To be, is to be related and without relationship there is no existence. Now, what do we mean by relationship? It is an interconnected challenge and response between two people, between you and me, the challenge which you throw out and which I accept, or to which I respond; also the challenge I throw out to you. So, the relationship of two people creates society; society is not independent of you and me; the mass is not by itself a separate entity, but you and I in our relationship to each other create the mass, the group, the society. So, relationship is the awareness of inter-connection between two people and what is that relationship generally based on? Is it not based on so-called interdependence, mutual assistance? At least we say it is mutual help, mutual aid and so on, but, actually, apart from words, apart from the emotional screen which we throw up against each other, what is it based upon? On mutual gratification, is it not? If I do not please you, you get rid of me, if I please you, you accept me either as your wife or as your neighbour or as your friend. That is the actual fact.

So, relationship is sought where there is mutual satisfaction, gratification, and when you do not find that satisfaction you change

relationship, either you divorce, or you remain together but seek gratification elsewhere or else you move from one relationship to another till you find what you seek, which is satisfaction, gratification and a sense of self-protection and comfort. After all that is our relationship in the world and that is the actual fact. So, relationship is sought where there can be security, where you as an individual can live in a state of security, in a state of gratification, in a state of ignorance, all of which always creates conflict, does it not? If you do not satisfy me and I am seeking satisfaction, naturally there must be conflict, because we are both seeking security in each other and when that security becomes uncertain you become jealous, you become violent, you become possessive and so on. So, relationship invariably results in possession, in condemnation, in self-assertive demands for security, for comfort and for gratification and in that there is naturally no love.

We talk about love, we talk about responsibility, duty, but there is really no love, and relationship is based on gratification, the effect of which we see in the present civilization. The way we treat our wives, children, neighbours, friends is an indication that in our relationship there is really no love at all. It is merely a mutual search for gratification and as this is so, what then is the purpose of relationship? What is its ultimate significance? Surely, if you observe yourself in relationship with others, do you not find that relationship is a process of self-revelation? Does not my contact with you reveal my own state of being if I am aware, if I am alert enough to be conscious of my own reaction in relationship? So, relationship really is a process of self-revelation which is a process of self-knowledge and in that revelation there are many unpleasant

things, disquieting, uncomfortable thoughts, activities and since I do not like what I discover I run away from a relationship which is not pleasant to a relationship which is pleasant. So, relationship has very little significance when we are merely seeking mutual gratification, but relationship becomes extraordinarily significant when it is a means of self-revelation and self-knowledge.

After all there is no relationship in love, is there? It is only when you love something and expect a return of your love that there is a relationship. But when you love, that is, when you give yourself over to something entirely, wholly, then there is no relationship. Is relationship a mutual gratification or is it a process of self-revelation? There is no gratification in love there is no self-revelation in love. You just love. Then what happens? If you do love, if there is such a love, then it is a marvellous thing. In such love there is no friction, there is not the one and the other there is complete unity. It is a state of integration, a complete being. There are such moments, such rare, happy, joyous moments, when there is complete love, complete communion. But what generally happens is that love is not what is important but the other, the object of love becomes important; the one to whom love is given becomes important and not love itself. Then the object of love, for various reasons either biological verbal, or because of a desire for gratification, for comfort and so on, becomes important and love recedes Then possession, jealousy and demands create conflict and love recedes further and further, and the further it recedes, the more the problem of relationship loses its significance, its worth and its meaning. So, love is one of the most difficult things to comprehend. It cannot come through an intellectual urgency, it

cannot be manufactured by various methods and means and disciplines. It is a state of being when the activities of the self have ceased but they will not cease if you merely suppress them, shun them or discipline them. You must understand the activities of the self in all the different layers of consciousness. We have moments when we do love, when there is no thought, no motive but those are rare we cling to them in memory and thus create a barrier between living reality and the action of our daily existence. So, in order to understand relationship it is important to understand first of all 'what is', what is actually taking place in our lives, in all the different subtle forms and also what relationship actually means. Relationship is self-revelation and it is because we do not want to be revealed to ourselves that we hide in comfort and then relationship loses its extraordinary depth, significance and beauty. There can be true relationship only when there is love but love is not the search for gratification. Love exists only when there is self forgetfulness, when there is complete communion, not between one or two, but communion with the highest, and that can only take place when the self is forgotten.

Question: The Theosophical Society announced you to be the Messiah and world teacher. Why did you leave the Theosophical Society and renounce the Messiahship?

Krishnamurti: I have received several questions of the kind and I thought I would answer them. It is not frightfully important, but I will try to answer them.

First of all let us examine the whole question of organizations. There is a rather lovely story of a man who was walking along the street and behind him were two strangers. As he walked along, he

saw something very bright and he picked it up and looked at it and put it in his pocket and the two men behind him observed this and one said to the other: "This is a very bad business for you, is it not?" and the other who was the devil answered: "No, what he picked up is truth. But I am going to help him organize it". You see it!

Can truth be organized? Can you find truth through an organization? Must you not go beyond and above all organizations to find truth? After all why do all spiritual organizations exist? They are based on different beliefs, are they not? You believe in one thing and somebody else believes in it too and around that belief you form an organization and what is the result? Beliefs and organizations are for- ever separating people, keeping people apart; you are a Hindu, I am a Muslim, you are a Christian and I am a Buddhist. Beliefs throughout history have acted as a barrier between man and man, and any organization based on a belief must inevitably bring war between man and man as it has done over and over again. We talk of brotherhood, but if you believe differently from me I am ready to cut your throat; we have seen it happen over and over again.

Are organizations necessary? You understand that I am not talking about organizations formed for the mutual convenience of man in his daily existence; I am talking of the psychological and the so-called spiritual organizations. Are they necessary? They exist on the supposition that they will help man to realize truth and they are a means of propaganda: you want to tell others what you think, or what you have learned, what appears to you to be a fact. And is truth propaganda? What is truth to someone, when

propagated surely ceases to be the truth for another. Does it not? Surely, reality, God or whatever you call it, is not to be propagated. It is to be experienced by every one for himself and that experience cannot be organized; the moment it is organized, propagated, it ceases to be the truth, it becomes a lie, therefore a hindrance to reality, because after all, the real, the immeasurable cannot be formulated, cannot be put into words, the unknown cannot be measured by the known, by the word, and when you measure it, it ceases to be the truth, therefore it ceases to be the real and therefore it is a lie, and therefore generally propaganda is a lie. And organizations that are supposed to be based on the search for truth, founded for the search of the real, become the propagandists' instruments, and so they cease to be of any significance; not only this particular organization in question but all spiritual organizations, become means of exploitation. They acquire property and property becomes awfully important; seeking members and all the rest of that business begins; they will not find truth for the obvious reason that the organization becomes more important than the search for reality. And no truth can be found through any organization because truth comes when there is freedom and freedom cannot exist when there is belief, for belief is merely the desire for security and a man who is caught in his need for security can never find that which is.

Now, with regard to Messiahship, it is very simple. I have never denied it and I do not think it matters very much whether I have or have not. What is important to you is whether what I say is the truth. So, don't go by the label, don't give importance to a name. Whether I am the world teacher or the Messiah or something else is

surely not important. If it is important to you then you will miss the truth of what I am saying because you will judge by the label and the label is so flimsy. Somebody will say that I am the Messiah and somebody else will say, that I am not and where are you? You are in the same confusion and the same misery, in the same conflict. So, surely, it is of very little significance. I am sorry to waste your time on this question. But whether I am or I am not the Messiah is of very little importance. But what is important is to find out, if you are really earnest, whether what I say is the truth and you can only find out whether what I say is truth by examining it, by being aware now, of what I am saying and finding out whether what I am saying can be worked out in daily life. What I am saying is not so very difficult to understand. The intellectual person will find it very difficult because his mind is perverted and a man of devotion also will find it extremely difficult, but the man who is really seeking will understand because of its simplicity. And what I am saying cannot be put into a few words and I am not going to attempt to say it in a few words because my answers to the questions and the various talks which I have given will reveal if you are interested in what I am saying.

Question: On two or three occasions in the course of the talks I have attended, I have become conscious, if I may venture to describe the experience properly, of standing in the presence of one vast void of utter silence and solitude for a fraction of a second. It feels as though I am at the entrance but dare not step into it. What feeling is this? Is it some hallucination, self-suggested, in the present stormy turbulent condition in which our daily life is passed?

Krishnamurti: There is always the danger, is there not, when one feels very strongly that one gets caught up in that feeling. That is how propaganda works, is it not? If you hear over and over again that you must destroy the Muslim or the Christian or the Buddhist or the German and when it is repeated endlessly, one is caught in that noise of repetition and swept off into certain kinds of action. But, during these talks and discussions there have been moments when we discussed and felt very deeply, when we perceived for ourselves certain states of consciousness and because we reached a point of great understanding and great depth, there was silence, there was no noise. It was absolute silence. But it becomes hallucination, if it is due to self-hypnosis; that is, if you yourself, during the discussion or talk, have not followed it and experienced it directly for yourself. Then such silences, such extraordinary states of being become escapes from the ordinary storm, from the every day conflict of existence. So, there is always the danger of being influenced by another for the good as well as for the bad. But, the fact that you have been influenced indicates that you can be influenced and therefore the question is not whether you should or should not be influenced for the good, but whether you should be influenced at all. If you can be influenced for the good, you can also be influenced for the bad; we have seen it happen over and over again and the bad wins more often than the good as indicated by the repeated wars and catastrophes that go on in the world almost constantly.

So, the problem is not whether you should enter this thought, this silence, this creative state of being, but whether you have come to it through understanding or through influence, through



persuasion or through your own careful, wise experience and understanding. Unless you have come to it through your own understanding, not merely intellectually and verbally, it has no meaning, for really there is no such thing as intellectual understanding; understanding is complete, whole and not partial. But if you come to that stillness through understanding, through being aware, it brings about the cessation of those conflicts and then through that understanding there is quietness and in that quietness and in that solitude, in that loneliness, there is reality. It is not that you are afraid to enter it, you cannot enter it. It must come to you, because if you go to it, you can only go to the known. If it comes to you it is the unknown, therefore the real. But, if you go to it, you have already formulated what it is and therefore that towards which you go is the known and therefore not the real. Therefore it must come to you. All greatness, like love, comes to you. If you pursue love it will never come, but if you are open, still, not demanding, it will come.

So, the question of influence is really very important because we all want to be influenced, we all want to be encouraged, because in ourselves we are uncertain, we are confused. And this is where the danger lies, in looking to another for clarification, for understanding. Clarification and understanding cannot be given to you by another, no matter who he is. Understanding or clarification comes when the mind is single, free, not distracted by effort. When you are interested in something, keen about it, you give your whole being to it. You are not distracted and in that giving of yourself, in order to find out what is true there comes that quietness, that amazing creative emptiness, that absolute silence, unenforced and

uninvited, and in that silence the real comes into being.

Question: You have said that a mind in bondage is vagrant, restless, disorderly. Will you please explain further what you mean?

Krishnamurti: To understand this question we must consider the whole problem of meditation and I hope you will not be too fatigued to follow this question and the things involved in the problem itself. I do not know if you have noticed that a mind that is in bondage, held by an idea or by a problem, is always restless, because it is always seeking an answer to the problem. Therefore it is always wandering. A mind that is in prison is always seeking freedom and therefore it is restless, but if it questions the prison itself, the bondage itself, then it is quiet because then it is pursuing the truth of that bondage and therefore not wandering away from the problem; the bondage is the problem itself.

The moment you are aware of a bondage, what happens? You want to free yourself from it. You want to understand it and therefore you are striving to do something about it. That means restlessness, disorder, vagrancy, but if you are interested, not in the solution of the problem but in the problem itself, which contains its own answer, then surely the mind becomes free, concentrated, because it no longer seeks a solution, but understands the problem itself; therefore the mind becomes extremely effective, clear and capable of pursuing swiftly every movement.

So, meditation then is the understanding of the problem itself which contains its own answer. Meditation is not mere repetition of words, mantrams, japams, or sitting in front of a picture or an image. Meditation is not prayer or a concentration, as I explained

before. Meditation is thought freeing itself from time because through time the timeless cannot be comprehended, and as the mind is the product of time, thought must cease if the real is to be. And the whole process of meditation causes thought to come to an end and it is very important to comprehend this because thought is the product of time, the experience of yesterday, thought is caught in the net of time and that which is of time can never comprehend that which is timeless, the eternal.

So, our problem then is to understand that the mind which is constantly creating time, is the product of time and therefore whatever it produces, whatever it fabricates, whatever it formulates, whatever it creates, is of time, whether it creates the Paramatman, or the Brahman or an idea or a machine. As thought is founded upon the past which is time, it cannot understand the timeless and therefore meditation is a process of freeing thought from time which means that thought must come to an end. Have you ever experimented with it? Have you not found how extraordinarily difficult it is for thought to come to an end because no sooner does one thought come into being than another pursues it, and so thought is never completed; and meditation is to carry one thought through right to the end, because that which ends knows renewal, that which is continuous is of time and therefore in that there is no renewal.

How then can one complete thought? This is the problem, for that which is complete has no continuity. That which is complete has an ending and therefore a renewal. So, how is thought to come to an end? Thought can only come to an end when the thinker understands himself; the thinker and the thought are not two

separate processes. The thinker is the thought, and the thinker separates himself from his thought for his self-protection, for his continuance, for his permanency and therefore the thinker is continually producing thought which is transforming, changing and gratifying. So, you have to understand the thinker, which means the thinker is not separate from the thought. Remove the thoughts, where is the thinker? Remove the qualities and where is the self, remove a man's property, his qualities, where is he? He is non-existent. Similarly remove the thoughts of the thinker, where is the thinker? Surely there is no thinker when the thought process is removed, which means we must complete every thought that arises whether good or bad; and to complete every thought through to its end is extremely arduous because it involves a slowing down of the mind. As a fast revolving motor cannot be understood save through being slowed down, so too, a mind which is to understand itself must slow itself down. Again, it is a very arduous task to have a mind go slowly, so that you can follow every thought through. But most of our minds are not moving, they are only vagrant, they are all over the place, disjointed, disorderly, confused; and to bring order out of that confusion and vagrancy, you will have to follow each thought through. In order to follow each thought through, write it down and you will see. Experiment with it, and you will see. Write down every thought if only for a period of two minutes. As in the case of a film, the quick movements cannot be followed and only when the film is slowed down can you follow the movements. Similarly a mind that is too fast, I should not say 'fast', - because most of our minds are not fast, they are disjointed, wandering, vagrant, - such a mind can only be understood by

slowing it down and it can only be slowed down by pursuing every thought as it comes. As you are listening to me your mind is slowed down and not wandering because you are following my thoughts; and as I am concentrated on what I am talking about, and as it is not mere intellection or verbal assertion, but an actual experience, you are following it actually, which indicates that you can slow down your mind and follow each thought through. But since you cannot be with me all the time, I suggest, you write down every thought and experiment with it and you will see what an extraordinary thing takes place. Your condemnations, your identifications or prejudices etc., will come out before a consciousness that is empty and one that is now capable of complete silence. A consciousness that is filled with all kinds of memories, traditions, racial prejudices, national demands, can never be still. And you will see that in that process, when thought frees itself from time, it is not possible to indulge in certain activities.

The other day a man came to see me and he wanted to find 'peace' as he called it, peace of mind. He wanted to find God and he also stated that he was a speculator. That is what we too want. We all want peace of mind, happiness, love and tranquillity and yet we are caught in those activities that are not quite orderly, that are not peaceful; we are caught in viciousness, in professions that are destructive such as of the lawyer, the soldier, the police, and so on. So, the understanding of the process of the mind will itself create a crisis in your daily life and you do not have to invite a crisis. It will create it and if you pursue further that crisis, then when the storm ceases there comes quietness like that of the pool when the breeze

stops. So, the problems that are self-created come to an end, and there is silence, a silence that is not induced or compelled, but a silence which is free from all problems and in that silence that which is unutterable comes into being.

Question: Does not the belief in reincarnation explain inequality in society?

Krishnamurti: What a callous way of resolving a problem! Does it resolve the problem? Does your belief in reincarnation resolve the problem? Everything goes on; has your belief altered that suffering? You have only explained it away to suit your convenience, but inequality remains. And can inequality be explained by a belief, by a theory, whether the theory is of the right or of the left whether it is an economic theory or a spiritual theory? When you believe in certain forms of socialism, either of the extreme left or of the modified left, does inequality cease because of the theory? Because you believe in reincarnation, that is in a progressive growth, which puts you a little higher than the other fellow because you are economically and socially better off, that theory comforts you; for you also believe that because you have worked and suffered in the past now you have earned the right to something, a spiritual bank account. Therefore you feel that you are a little superior and the other fellow is a little bit under you, until he in turn will come up but somebody will always be below and somebody always above. Surely, this is the most extraordinary way of regarding life, is it not, the most brutal and callous way of explaining it. You want explanations and explanations seem apparently to satisfy you whether they are political, or religious. Surely, reincarnation or the belief in reincarnation is no solution

for any of the difficulties. Is it? It is merely a postponement, an explanation but the facts are `inequality', the untouchables, the Brahmin and the non-Brahmin or the vicious commissar and the poor devil who works for the commissar; the fact remains that there is division and no kind of explanation however beautiful, however callous, however scientific is going to eliminate it.

I am sorry, some of you seem rather bored by this question but we will have to go into it. And how is this inequality to be overcome? Can inequality be wiped away by a system, economic social or religious? Can a system, of the left or of the right, religious or any other kind, dispel the actual fact that men like to divide themselves into superiors and inferiors? Revolutions have taken place but they have not produced equality, though in the beginning they maintained that there must be equality; and yet when the revolution has been accomplished, when the froth, when the excitement is over, there is still inequality, the boss, the tyrant dictator and all the rest of the ugly business of existence. No government, no theory can wipe that out and to look to a theory, look to a belief is to be the most stupid, callous person. You look to a belief, to a system when your hearts are dry, when you have no love; then systems become important. Surely, when you love somebody, there is no equality or inequality. There is neither the prostitute nor the righteous. To the man caught up in his righteousness, there is division.

So, belief is not the solution, a system is not the way to equalize. You may equalize economically, but even then that economic equalization becomes unimportant as long as the psychological inequality exists; and this cannot be wiped out by

economic systems. So, the only solution and the true one, and the lasting one, is love, affection, kindness, and mercy. But love is extremely difficult for a man who is caught up in activities of unmercy, in competition, in ruthlessness. Being caught up in gratifying means, through acquisition, he must find an explanation and reincarnation satisfies him. He can pursue his monstrous, ugly ways and yet feel that he is all right.

Sirs, belief is not a substitution for love and because we do not know love, because we do not know what love is, we indulge in theories and practices, we search for systems, economic and social or religious, that will dissolve this monstrous inequality. When you love there is neither the intellectual nor the dull, neither the sinner nor the righteous. And it is a marvellous thing to be so free, and only love can give that freedom and not a belief and love is possible only when beliefs drop away, when you are not looking to a system, when you become human and not mechanical. How little we love in our daily life! You don't love your sons, your daughters, your wives or your husbands and because you do not know them, you do not know yourselves. And, when we know ourselves more and more, we begin to understand the significance of love and love is the most extraordinary factor in life because it resolves all our difficulties. It is not a mere assertion or my say-so, but you try and drop all your aggressions, competitions, pursuits and be simple and you will find love. The man who is simple does not bother to know who is superior and who is inferior, who is the master, who is the disciple because he is content with what he is and the understanding of 'what is' brings love and happiness.

Question: I have made the rounds of various teachers and I



would like to know from you what is the purpose of life?

Krishnamurti: It is a very odd fact in life, this pursuit of gurus. You know how ladies especially do a great deal of `window-shopping; they go from window to window looking from the outside to see what dress or what else they would buy if they had the money. Similarly there are many who indulge in this peculiar game of going from guru to guru, always window shopping. What happens to such people? What happens, Sirs, when you go from guru to guru, from teacher to teacher? You get emotionally excited, stretched, and when you keep on stretching, stimulating yourself artificially, what happens? The elasticity of emotion wears out. Does it not? Keep on stretching artificially, stimulated first by one and then by another, and you lose all feeling; your elasticity, quickness, pliability are gone. Why do you go from guru to guru, from teacher to teacher? Obviously for protection, but where do you find protection always? With the teacher who gratifies you. The teacher who protects you is your own gratification. If the teacher tells you to give up and become very simple, nice, kindly, loving, you will not go to him and if he tells you to meditate, to prostrate yourself at his feet, then you will follow him, because that is a child's game. If you feel very comfortable in his presence you go, because that again is very easy. But, if he demands something beyond your miserable comforts and security, then you go and find another teacher. So, this pursuit of the guru makes the mind dull and the emotion weak, and the original strength and vitality are lost. What has happened to all of you who have followed gurus? You have lost that extraordinary sensitivity, quickness of thought and depth of emotion. It is obvious, is it not? It is the truth.

That is one part of the question. The other part concerns the purpose of life. Apparently, the questioner must have been told by the various teachers what the purpose of life is and now, he wants to add my views to his collection, to see which is the best, which is the most suitable. Sirs, it is all so infantile, so immature. I know the person who wrote this question, a married man in a responsible position. See the tragedy of it. He wants to find out from someone, make a collection of purposes of life and choose one out of them. Sirs, it is tragic, not laughable. It shows the state of mind of the majority of us. We are mature in office, in bringing up children, in getting money, but immature in thought and in life. We do not know what it means to love.

So, the questioner wants to know what is the purpose of life. How are you going to find out? Shall I tell you what it means, or must you not find out for yourself what the purpose of life is. To remain at the office day after day, month after month, pursuing money, position, power, ambition, is that the purpose of life? Is it the purpose of life to worship graven images, to perform rituals without significance, without meaning indulge in mere repetition? Is it the purpose of life to acquire virtue and be walled in by barren righteousness? If the purpose of life is none of these then what is it? To find what is the purpose of life, must you not go beyond all these? Then you will find out. Then you need not seek out the purpose of life. Surely the man in sorrow is not seeking the purpose of life, he wants to be free of sorrow. But you see, we do not suffer. Rather, we suffer and we escape from our suffering and therefore we do not understand suffering. So a question of this kind indicates the extraordinary inefficiency of the thinker and the

questioner. But having put that question to me and through my answer, he should now find out for himself what the purpose of life is. You see about your confusion, misery and what is the outcome of it all? How can you go to another to find out? To find out the outcome of all this confusion, you should understand the one who is confused, the man who brought about this confusion, which is yourself. This chaos is the result of our own thought, own feeling, and to understand that confusion, that misery, you have to understand yourself and as you proceed deeper and deeper in understanding yourself you will find out what is the significance of life. Merely to stand at the edge of confusion and ask what is the significance of life has very little meaning. Sirs, it is like a man who has lost the song in his heart. Naturally he is always seeking for somebody who has a song, he is enchanted by the voice of others, he is always seeking a better singer because in his own heart there is no song. There can be song in his heart only when he discards everything and ceases to follow the teacher. There comes a time when you become aware of your desires, when you do not escape from them, but understand them. It requires earnestness, it requires extraordinary serious attention and he who is already in earnest has begun to understand and in him there is hope. There is hope not in performances, not in gurus, but only in yourself.

December 7, 1947

## **MADRAS 9TH PUBLIC TALK 14TH DECEMBER, 1947**

It is always difficult to communicate because the verbal expression and understanding are on different levels, are they not? We listen to words but the understanding comes only when we hear within ourselves what is being said. So, I think there is a difference between listening and hearing. Those of us who are accustomed to listening, really hardly ever understand because our understanding then is merely verbal, on the verbal level. But hearing I think is different. Hearing is more subjective, not as an opposite but in itself. Hearing is more what is taking place, you are hearing what is taking place in yourself rather than listening to some one outside. So, as I have been suggesting in all these talks and discussions, it would be a waste of time if you merely listen to words and do not hear in yourself their significance, it would be gathering from outside rather than hearing your own process of thinking and feeling.

As I have said over and over again, communication can only exist, on the same level, at the same time. If you are merely listening to the words of someone else and not to their different significance and meaning, then the words become a barrier. And communion between you and me can exist only when there is pliability, a pliability of mind and heart which is love, which is affection. After all when two people love, not merely seek gratification in each other, but really love, there is communion, instantaneous, on the same level and at the same time. And that is the beauty of love when there is instantaneous comprehension in

words. I feel that real understanding comes only when there is such communion between people, between you and myself, not in you listening to a talk or in my giving a talk, which as a matter of fact I am not, for I am just thinking aloud with you, and therefore I am not teaching you and you are not my pupil, but we both think aloud together so that we both might comprehend the extraordinary significance of living and suffering. So, I am not giving a discourse nor are you listening to one, but as we are trying together to find out what is true, it requires a different kind of understanding rather than merely listening to words. It demands a certain letting down of verbal barriers, a certain freedom from our usual, everyday prejudices, because we must go beyond. But, if we can, at least temporarily, put away our screen, our prejudices, our frame of references, our demands and feelings as though we were really enjoying, hearing things which we really love, which we want to inquire about and discover, then perhaps we will be able to go beyond the verbal level and therefore bring understanding into our daily life and action. If we do not do this I do not see the point of listening to any talk. If there is no integration between thinking, feeling and action, we cease to be really intelligent human beings. We merely live in compartments and compartmental living is really very destructive and distracting and that is what has happened in the world, and what is happening at the present time. We have developed the intellect so abnormally that we have lost all sense of proportion and sensitivity to existence.

As I have been taking different subjects at different talks, I want to take this evening briefly and naturally, the problem of suffering. Happiness is not the denial of sorrow, but the understanding of

sorrow. Most of us think that suffering will make us intelligent. At least we have been told that through suffering you will awaken understanding and intelligence, that through suffering you store up knowledge, through suffering you acquire comprehension.

Whereas, if you examine a little more closely you will find that suffering like pain and conflict really dulls what is and to regard suffering as a means to understanding or intelligence is really fallacious. That is what we have been accustomed to think. Does suffering bring understanding? To find out what actually takes place we must examine, must we not, what happens to us when we suffer? What do we mean by suffering? A sense of disturbance, is it not? An inward, psychological disturbance. I am not for the moment dealing with the outward suffering, diseases and so on, but inward suffering, psychological suffering as when you lose somebody, when you feel frustrated, when your existence has no meaning, when the future becomes all important, or when you regard with yearning the past as more beautiful, more happy than the present, and so on. That implies a contradiction, a dissatisfaction with the present, pain and responsibility, the sense of emptiness, the utter emptiness of relationship which has no meaning except the merely physical, the sense of void that can never be filled.

So, to understand suffering we must not take anything for granted, it seems to me, but really examine what is actually taking place in us when we suffer, what is our natural and instinctive response. Generally is it not to run away from it? To escape through explanations, through beliefs, through theories, through the priest, through the image; we know the various systems of escapes,

the radio, the newspaper, the movie, drugs, gurus. We try anything to get away from the constant ache, pain and suffering. Even the very inquiry into the cause of suffering, is that not also an escape? If we examine it with a little care, we know very well what is the cause of suffering. We need not spend hours, days, we need not go to a guru to find out what is the cause of suffering. We know it. I do not think we need to be told what the cause of suffering is; it is obvious, is it not? But what happens when we inquire into the reason for suffering? We are really escaping intellectually into the cause or into the search for the cause. So, what generally happens is that we become very skilful, very clever in our escapes, but suffering continues and this becoming intelligent in escapes is called intelligent living. That is, you progress - it is called progress through the change of objects of escape, but suffering, in some way or other, continues.

So, how is suffering to be understood? Merely to inquire into the cause is stupid, for obviously we know what it is; our everyday stupid existence, our prejudices, our greeds, our pettiness, our desire to continue. So, it is merely information and it is of no significance when we begin to understand what suffering is. You do not have to run away from it. The more you are familiar with it, the more you are acquainted with it, the more you love it, the more you invite it, talk with it, sleep with it, the more it gives off its perfume, its significance. But the moment you run away from it, whether through your intellect or through superstition, science or romance, suffering continues.

So, suffering is really to be understood and not overcome, because any form of overcoming can be conquered again; suffering

can only be understood through self-knowledge, which is right thinking. And right thinking is not possible when you condemn suffering or become identified, push away, that with which you identify, you accept, but to understand suffering you have to live with it, take it as it is. You do not deny beauty, but you accept it. Similarly if we deny suffering we also deny beauty, happiness; because happiness is not the opposite of suffering and beauty is not the denial of the ugly. When you deny the one you deny the other. Only right thinking which comes through awareness of every day feeling and action, can dissolve the cause that brings about pain and suffering.

Question: I heard your last Sunday talk about duality and the pain of it, but as you did not explain how to overcome the opposite, will you please go further into it?

Krishnamurti: Let us go into it very delicately. Let us find out its enormous significance. We know the conflict of the opposites. We are caught in that long corridor of pain, always overcoming the one and trying to become the other. That is our existence. I am this and I want to become that; I am not this and I would like to be that; that is the constant struggle of everyone; of the bank-clerk, the manager, the seeker after truth. Our everyday struggle in life is based on a constant battle of becoming, of transforming this into that. So, I needn't go into more details concerning the conflict and the pain of the opposites.

Now, does the opposite exist? We know that what exists is only the actual. But the opposite is only the negative response to what is, is it not? It has no existence apart from 'what is.' That is : I am arrogant and that is a fact and the negative response to that is



humility and I accept humility as an opposite because I have been told that arrogance is wrong; or I have found it to be painful; or religiously, morally, and ethically it is taboo. So, I want to get rid of arrogance, it no longer pays me to be arrogant. So, I would like to become humble, the opposite. What actually happens is that I am arrogant and I would like to become humble. Humility is an idea, not an actuality. The actual is the arrogance, the other is not, but I would like to become that other. Therefore the desire to become what I am not creates the opposite but the opposite is non-existent, it is only an ideal which I would like to realize. So, it seems to me an utter waste of time to meditate or try in some other way to become the opposite. Love is not the opposite of hate. If it is, it would not be love, because after all, an opposite has within it the seed of its own opposite; as humility is the outcome of arrogance, therefore it has the seed of arrogance. Whereas if we understood the whole significance of arrogance, then its opposite also would cease. What exists is arrogance and if I can understand that, I need not go into the battle of becoming something.

To put it differently, the present is the result of the past and whatever the present is, it must create the future which is its opposite, yet still caught in the net of time. So, if I can understand the whole significance of the present, I see the present as the passage of the past into the future. As long as thought is caught in the conflict of the opposites, it cannot understand what is. If I want to understand what is, I must give my whole attention, my whole being to it and not be distracted by the opposites. The opposite is merely the ideal, that which is not, that which I would like to become. Therefore it is non-existent, it is merely the negative wish

of what is.

So, that is one point. The second is: why do we name a feeling? Why do we name a reaction as anger, as jealousy, as envy, as hate, and so on? Why do we term it? Do you term it in order to understand it or do you term it as a means of recognizing it? Is the feeling independent of the term? Or do you understand the feeling through the term? If you understand the feeling through the term, through the word, through the name, then the name becomes important and not the feeling and would it be possible not to name the feeling at all? Would it be possible not to term it but when you do term it, what happens? You bring a framework of references to a living feeling and thereby absorb the living feeling into time, which only strengthens memory, which is the I. And what happens, if you do not name a feeling, give it a term? If you do not give that feeling, that reaction, that response a name, a term, what would happen to that feeling? Does it not come to an end? You try it and you will see what happens. You have a feeling arising or a reaction, a response to a challenge and instinctively you name it, you term it, and then what do you do? The living response is put into a frame of past references which only strengthens your memory and therefore gives continuity to the I. But if you do not give it a name, what would happen? If you experiment you will see the reaction. The feeling soon withers away. Experiment with it and try it out for yourself.

So, any response to a challenge comes to an end when you do not name it and put it in the frame of references. Now we have only learned that a painful reaction can be got rid of that way: don't name it, it will vanish. But, will you do the same thing with

pleasurable feelings? That is, if you have a pleasure and if you do not name it, it will also wither away, will it not? It will, if you have experimented with what I have been talking about and discussing in the mornings. So, pleasurable reactions and painful reactions wither away when you do not term them, when they are not absorbed into the framework of references. You will see if you experiment with it that it is a fact.

But, is love also a response, a reaction not to be named and so left to wither? It will wither if it is an opposite of hate, because then it is merely a response to a challenge; but surely it is not a response to a challenge. It is a state of being. It is its own eternity but with most of us it has an opposite. I am brutal and I must cultivate kindness, I must become merciful, I must become generous. The becoming creates the opposite either positively or negatively. But you cannot try to cultivate love, surely. If you try to cultivate mercy, it being an opposite ceases to be mercy, also mercy contains its own opposite, hate. Love can be known surely only when the sense of becoming which creates the opposite ceases.

So, the problem of duality, which your sacred books have said you must transcend, which all your life you have struggled to transcend but in which you are still caught, seems to me, fallacious. But in the understanding of what the opposite is, duality ceases to exist. Opposite exists only when you try to avoid what is, in order to become something which is not; but in understanding what is, which for instance is arrogance with all its implications, not only at a particular level but through all the layers of one's consciousness - not only the petty official arrogance of a bureaucracy, but the

whole arrogance of achievement - in understanding arrogance not as an opposite, because as I have explained, arrogance when it becomes humility, is still arrogance; in understanding arrogance in all its significance and without naming the feeling, you will see it wither away. And as love is not the opposite of hate, you cannot approach it through the process of cultivation or becoming. That process of becoming must entirely cease before love can be.

Question: Gandhiji says in a recent article that religion and nationalism are both equally dear to man and one cannot be bartered away in favour of the other. What do you say?

Krishnamurti: I wonder what you will say. I wonder what is your response to this. Will you question your so-called leaders? Must you not criticize, question, inquire to find out the truth and not merely accept? Will you dare to criticize? Because if you dared you would lose your job, would you not? In this question is implied the acceptance of authority; some one tells and you accept. In acceptance there is blindness and total lack of thought. It does not matter who it is that speaks. If you have lost the critical ability to inquire, to find out, you will never discover what truth is. And that is the tragedy of leaders, political or religious, because you create them, and thus there is mutual exploitation. And in India, as elsewhere, it is extraordinary to watch the growth of leaders, of tyrants, in the name of religion or in the name of politics; and the more power they have the more evil they become.

One of the points we have to bear in mind is, not to accept but to inquire, to find out what truth is; and to find out what truth is you must have an open heart and open mind and not be guided by any teacher or any politician. But you see, that means you have to

think for yourself. You have to venture out into the open, uncharted seas; but we would rather be told what to think.

I am not criticizing any individual, I am not talking about any specific leader, but about the whole idea of authority. Surely, Sirs, you cannot create in the bonds of authority. Where there is authority, creation ceases. You may invent mechanical things but creation as reality, ceases, and I think that is one of the curses of this country and other countries. When you have given yourself to somebody, whether it is your priest or a political leader or the man who says he is the Messiah or a messenger of God, you cease to feel, to think and as human beings you are non-existent. Surely that is no solution to our problems, to our catastrophes, to our miseries.

Now, it is said that religion and nationalism are both dear to man and we cannot barter away one in favour of the other. Now, let us find out the truth of this, not by opposing or defending, but really find out the truth of this matter because it is truth that is going to liberate us, give us happiness, not the assertion of any one.

What do you mean by religion? Surely, it is not going to church or going to the temple and worshipping images, reading the sacred books, or belonging to any religious sect or body. Surely that is not religion. Is it? And religion is not belief. Religion implies, does it not, the search for God, for Truth, or whatever name you give it. Therefore if that is so, then organized religions are an impediment because they constrict thought and feeling by their beliefs, by their images made either by the hand or the mind, by their ruthless ceremonies and all the rest of it. So, religion is the search after Reality and not the performance of ceremonies, the reading of sacred books and so on. So, that means that religion as an

organized form of belief, ceases to be religion. In the inquiry after Truth, the approach must be negative and not positive because positive action always leads to a positive end which can only be that which you know. And Reality is the unknowable and you cannot imagine it or put it into words. It is the unknown. Therefore any positive approach to the unknown will make the unknown knowable and therefore that is not the Truth. Truth is when the known ceases to be. The Eternal is approached not through time. The Eternal is when time ceases, that is when thought which is the result of time comes to an end. So, religion is not the positive; it is not dogmatic, assertive or convertive; it is not the worship of images.

And what is nationalism? The feeling, is it not, of belonging to a group of people or to a country? When you call yourself a Hindu, a Mussalman or a Christian, what do you do? Does it not give you a sense of well-being, to feel that you are united with something you consider greater than yourself. When I say I am an Indian there is a sense of belonging to a whole group of people, to an ancient land with all the vanity implied in it. Is it not so? I belong to my family and it also gives me a sense of continuity; property, ownership gives me a sense of continuity. The idea gives me a sense of continuity. Therefore through nationalism I continue, the 'mine' continues, therefore I identify myself with what is considered the larger, the whole, the country called India. In myself I am empty, shallow, poor, I am nothing; but if I identify myself with something called India, an idea, then I am well placed, I have happiness and through that idea I can be exploited, I can butcher other countries with immunity. That is what has been

happening in the world; the Germans fighting the French, Hindus fighting the Muslims and so on, all in the name of nationalism, in the name of country, in the name of God, in the name of Peace. Because I like to be identified with something which I call India, which is really myself enlarged, and when you attack that I am ready to kill you because without it I am not. Therefore I invest in nationalism all my feelings, it takes the place of religion, and that is what is happening now; Gods are disappearing and the States are taking their places. Both are ideas and therefore you have nothing to lose; that you barter one for the other is of very little importance, because you are really, fundamentally seeking continuance through a concept, and whether it is India or God or Germany or something else does not matter as long as you, as an entity, can continue in some form.

So, nationalism like organized religion has brought division between man and man. Through nationalism you can never find brotherhood. If you are a nationalist and try to become brotherly you are living in deceit because you cannot be identified with one and deny the rest. The moment you identify yourself either with a belief or with a country you are the creator of wars. You may speak of brotherhood but you live in a state of suppression, therefore you are causing wars. I do not see much difference between nationalism and organized religion. Both have brought misery to man, both have created division, both have spread destruction, conflict; because through beliefs and through patriotism they separate man from man. Surely, you must go beyond these petty images created by the mind or by the hand, to find Truth, must you not? You must cease to be nationalistic however thrilling it may be,

however stimulating and you must cease to belong to any particular religion in order to find Reality, must you not? As both nationalism and organized religion are inventions of the mind, of time, to understand the timeless, you must be free of time. This is extremely difficult in the modern world as the modern world is geared for war, total war, total destruction which nationalism or organized religion render inevitable; therefore a man who desires to find Truth must leave these two behind, for Truth is to be found not in an image made by the hand or by the mind, but when thought ceases; the ending of thought is the ending of time. Truth can only be understood through self - knowledge, and not by following the assertion of any leader.

Question: You have talked of exploitation as being evil. Do you not also exploit?

Krishnamurti: I am glad that you have still the capacity to criticize. It is through that we will find Truth and not by hiding behind the defence of words. Yet, most of us have erected walls of words which it is very difficult to penetrate. I am quite willing to expose myself, and I will, and you can have a great deal of fun.

What do you mean by exploitation? Have you thought about it, I wonder, or merely read about it in books and so are able to repeat to me or to yourself assertions of the left or of the right. What does exploitation mean? Does it not mean using another for your own profit either socially or psychologically? Society, as it is established at present, makes it inevitable, unfortunately, to use others; the shirt which I put on and the kurtha I am wearing are the result of exploitation and how can anyone, in a society which is constructed in this manner, cease to exploit? You understand what



I mean by exploitation; using another for your own personal benefit, personal gain, personal achievement. All that I can do is to say to myself that I will have a minimum, and I have decided what my minimum shall be. It is of very little importance to me whether I have much or little. To have much is a bothersome thing, as people who have much will tell you. The limiting of the needs can only come about when the needs are not used for psychological purposes, that is, when I do not use the essentials of life as a means to psychological contentment, or psychological gratification. The use of property as a means of self-aggrandizement, I call exploitation. But exploitation ceases when I use the essentials as essentials and no more; I hope you understand that point.

Exploitation begins when needs become greed, when needs become psychological necessities. The needs which are food, clothing and shelter have very little significance in themselves except to feed one, to clothe one and shelter one. Surely exploitation ceases when the needs do not go over into the psychological field because, after all, when you examine the needs they are food, clothing and shelter and a happy man is not bothered by these, because he has other riches, he has other treasures. The man who has no other treasures, makes the sensate values predominant and this creates such havoc in the world. So, if I may be personal, as I do not use the essentials of life for psychological aggrandizement I am really not exploiting anyone. You may call me an exploiter, but in my heart I know I am not.

The problem of psychological exploitation is much more difficult. Psychologically, we depend on things, on beliefs or on ideas. That is, psychologically, things, relationship and ideas

become important as long as things, relationship and ideas fill our psychological emptiness; that is, being inwardly poor, insufficient, fearful, uncertain, we seek security in things, or in relationship, or in ideas. That search for security in things, in beliefs, in ideas is the beginning of real exploitation. We know the result of seeking psychological security in things; it leads to war, to destruction, to such social chaos and degradation as exist in India and elsewhere at the present time. Things have become extraordinarily important to you, because they fill your psychological emptiness. You are the things, take away the things, where are you? So, you must have a bank account, it is your bank account, you are the owner. And in relationship too, what happens? Being psychologically empty you depend on your husband, on your wife, on your friends. So, dependence becomes very important, therefore there is jealousy, fear, possessiveness and all the bother of trying to overcome possessiveness. Similarly when you are inwardly empty, ideas and beliefs become extraordinarily important, the leader, the messenger, the saviour become important.

So, exploitation begins fundamentally, deeply, profoundly, only when you, the individual, the society, have that painful, psychological emptiness of which we are aware sometimes, but which generally is very carefully concealed. Such exploitation, psychological exploitation is far worse, because then the name matters, because then things matter, ideas matter, the thought as knowledge matters. Surely through knowledge you cannot find the Real. Only when knowledge ceases the Real is, for knowledge is merely the product of thought and thought is the result of time and that which is the product of time can never find the timeless. So,

things, names and ideas become extraordinarily significant when through them you are expanding. And that expansive process is the beginning of real exploitation. You cease to exploit when you recognize the significance of property for what it is, for what it gives you, which is very little. When you see the significance of relationship for what it is and not for the gratification it gives you, and when you see the idea not as self-protection, as security, but as merely an idea, then they have their own significance and very little else because, after all, if in relationship, you seek self-expansion through gratification, relationship ceases, relationship becomes very painful. Relationship is a process of self-revelation, a means of discovering your own way of thinking, of feeling. If you use property as a means of self-expansion, then it leads to chaos, to an utterly senseless existence which is what the world leads at the present time. Trying to solve the problem of existence on its own level brings destruction and the same is true of ideation. When you use knowledge, idea, to gain psychological gratification you set man against man which again produces hatred, envy and misery. So, really exploitation takes place when there is self-expansion whether it is in the name of God or in the name of anything else. Exploitation is not swept away through legislation. You may establish a physically non-exploited world, but it will lead to exploitation on another level where the boss will still be all important. So, exploitation can be understood and really brought to an end only when you understand your own way of thinking, feeling and acting, that is, through self-knowledge you begin to perceive the utter emptiness of your own existence, which is a fact that has been covered over by ideation, by relationship, by things.

When you realize that emptiness and do not try to escape from it through any means, then that which is, is transformed.

Question: What is the difference between surrendering to the will of God and what you are saying about the acceptance of what is?

Krishnamurti: Surely there is a vast difference, is there not? Surrendering to the will of God implies that you already know the will of God. You are not surrendering to something you do not know. If you know Reality, you cannot surrender to it. You cease to exist. There is no surrendering to a higher will. If you are surrendering to a higher will then that higher will is the projection of yourself, for the Real cannot be known through the known. It comes into being only when the known ceases to be. The known is a creation of the mind because thought is the result of the known, of the past and thought can only create what it knows and therefore what it knows is not the eternal. That is why when you surrender to the will of God you are surrendering to your own projection; it may be gratifying, comforting, but it is not the Real. To understand what is, demands a different process, perhaps the word process is not right but what I mean is this: to understand what is, is much more difficult, it requires greater intelligence, greater awareness, than merely to accept or give yourself over to an idea. To understand what is does not demand effort and as I pointed out in my earlier talks, effort is a distraction. To understand something, to understand what is, you cannot be distracted, can you? If I want to understand what you are saying, I cannot listen to music, to the noise of people outside, I must give my whole attention to it. So, it is extraordinarily difficult and arduous to be aware of what is,

because our very thinking has become a distraction. We do not want to understand what is. We look at what is, through the spectacles of prejudices, of condemnation or of identification, and it is very arduous to remove these spectacles and to look at what is. Surely, what is, is a fact, is the Truth and all else is an escape, is not the Truth, as we said earlier this evening. To understand what is, the conflict of duality must cease, because the negative response of becoming something other than what is, is the denial of the understanding of what is. If I want to understand arrogance, I must not go into the opposite, I must not be distracted by the effort of becoming, or even by the effort of trying to understand what is. If I am arrogant, what happens? If I do not name arrogance, it ceases, which means that in the problem itself is the answer and not away from it. So, it is not a question of accepting what is, you do not accept what is, you do not accept that you are brown, because it is a fact; only when you are trying to become something else you have to accept. The moment you recognize a fact, it ceases to have any significance; but a mind that is trained to think of the past or of the future, trained to run away in multifarious directions, such a mind is incapable of understanding what is. But without understanding what is, surely you cannot find what is Real and without that understanding, life has no significance, life is a constant battle wherein pain and suffering continue. The Real can only be understood by thinking, by understanding what is. It cannot be understood if there is any condemnation or identification; the mind that is always condemning or identifying cannot understand. It can only understand that within which it is caught. The understanding of what is, being aware of what is, reveals

extraordinary depths is which is Reality, happiness and joy.

December 14, 1947

## **MADRAS 10TH PUBLIC TALK 21ST DECEMBER, 1947**

There are so many problems, and especially at this time when there is so much confusion, when each one, each society, each group of people or nation, is seeking security at the expense of others, it seems to me very important to find out how to think rightly as a problem arises, how to confront the problem rightly; what is important is not what we should think about the problem, nor what our attitude should be towards the problem, but how to think about it. We are accustomed to being told what to think, in what manner to approach a problem but we do not know what thinking is. So, it seems to me very important to find out what is right thinking because the various problems that arise, the problems which confront us constantly, demand right thinking.

There is a right solution for each problem but it requires right thinking and not the mere desire to solve the problem. The point is not what to think, but how to think rightly. I would like to discuss this with you if I may, this evening, for there can be right action only if there is right thinking. If we do not know how to think we do not know how to act.

So, what is thinking? I wonder if you have ever asked yourself that question. What is thinking? As I have often said, you don't have to wait for an answer from me but let us think over the problem together because I do not consider this to be a lecture or a talk or a discourse in which you are merely listeners; you are participants in this discussion; let us therefore think together about each problem. So, don't merely wait to hear an answer from me.

What is thinking, what is the process of thinking? As we know it, it is a response to memory, is it not? You have certain memories and they leave certain marks and to this residue you respond. Memory thus is accumulation of the residue of experience. So, thinking, which is the response to memory, is always conditioned and as we know, that is the actual fact, our daily existence. That is, you have an experience and you translate that experience according to previous memories and so the experience, which has been translated, is gathered as memory and according to that memory you respond and this is called thinking. Surely such thinking only strengthens conditioning, which only produces more conflict, more pain and more sorrow.

That is, memory is constantly responding to the residue of experience which we call memory. It is responding to a challenge and this challenge and response to memory we call thinking, because life is a series of challenges and responses and the response is always conditioned by memory and that response to memory we call thinking. But the challenge is always new, it is never the old and our thinking is always old because it is the response of the past. So, believing is not thinking, believing is only conditioned thinking and conditioned experience - I am using the ordinary word conditioning and not the technical one. If you believe in something, you experience it and your experience is conditioned because it is based on a belief which is also conditioned. So belief is not thinking at all, it is only a response to a memory. So, that is what we are doing in our daily life if we examine ourselves. You have the experience which leaves a residue which is memory and according to that memory you think,



and that response which we call thinking is always conditioned because belief is always conditioned memory.

So, our thinking, which is the response to a challenge which is ever new, is always conditioned and therefore produces further conflict, further suffering and further pain. This is a fact, this is our daily existence. When we say we are thinking, that is what we mean. But, is that thinking? What then is thinking? When we use the word thinking in our daily life it is thinking based on memory, thinking which is a response and a reaction to memory and that response to memory comes from a challenge. You see a picture, you criticize it according to the background you have. You listen to music and you interpret it according to the traditions and according to the frame of reference you have. If you have had western training in music you will not respond to Indian music.

So, this is what we call thinking, a series of responses to memory and therefore thinking is always conditioned and that is a fact. Now, I ask myself, and I hope you are doing it too, is that thinking? These responses to memory, is that thinking? So, thinking, as we know it, is it really thinking or merely responding to memory and therefore not thinking? What then is thinking? Don't tell me it is response to memory, but what is thinking? Have you ever thought about it? Have you ever sat down and said to yourself what is thinking, what do you mean by thinking? You say ordinarily it is a response to memory. But is that thinking? Surely that is not thinking. So what is thinking?

Now, as it is a new problem, when you are asked a question what is thinking what do you do? It is a new question, a new problem presented to you and how do you respond to it? When you

are asked what is thinking, what is your response? You have never thought about it. So, what happens? You are silent, aren't you? Please follow this very carefully. There is a new problem presented to you: what is thinking; and as you have never thought about it and since it is new there is naturally a hesitancy, a sense of quietness and a stillness of observation. Is there not? You are watching, you are not translating, you are very alert and your mind is extremely concentrated if the question is vital and interesting, which it is. If you observe yourself when this question is asked you, you will see that your mind is not asleep, but very alert and very conscious, yet passive. It is waiting to find an answer. Now, that alert yet passive state is surely thinking because that is not conditioned thinking. There is passive, alert awareness, isn't there? Because your mind is very quiet and because it is confronted with a new problem, it is not asleep, but very alert and aware yet passive; it is not active because it does not know the answer, it is not even seeking an answer because it does not know. So that state of awareness, passive awareness is really thinking, is it not? It is the highest form of thinking because there is no positive comprehension, there is no conditioned response, it is a state of negation. Would it not be possible to meet every problem in this way, anew, because then the problem gives its significance; then you meet a problem, as sorrow, for instance and it will give its significance and therefore the problem ceases. But when you try to solve the problem by what you call thinking which is only response to memory, then because memory is conditioned, you further complicate the problem.

You can experiment with this for yourself very simply and you

will see how remarkably it works. For instance, you are in front of a modern painting. Your instinctive response is that you don't understand it and you push it aside, or else you ask who painted it, and if it is some big name you say it is very good; or again according to your training, you translate the picture. You respond according to your background or your conditioning. But suppose you put aside, if you can, the training, the classical training you have had and remain very quiet, very passive but alert in front of the picture. Does not the picture then tell you, give you its significance? So, passive awareness is surely the highest form of thinking because you are so receptive, so alert that the picture conveys its meaning to you. So, similarly if we could meet each problem with this alert, passive awareness which you experience now, when I ask you what is thinking, you are puzzled, you are bewildered and if you can go beyond that bewilderment, that puzzle, you say, 'I do not know.' That unknowingness is not a sleepy condition; on the contrary it is a very alert passive state of the mind in which there is deep silence waiting for the right significance.

But, what we call thinking is generally understood as a response of memory and when you meet a problem with the response of memory the problem is not understood and therefore there's still more confusion. But, if you are able to meet each problem, with this passive awareness, which is choiceless, then the problem yields its significance and therefore the problem is transcended.

Question: I dream a great deal. Have dreams any significance?

Krishnamurti: This is really an extremely important and very difficult problem because many things are implied. First of all, are

we awake or partly awake, or are we asleep most of the time? When are you awake? When there is a tremendous crisis, when there is interest, when there is a problem. But when there is a problem our desire is to escape from it through different ways and thereby we put ourselves to sleep. When there is a crisis what do you do? You try to solve the crisis according to the framework of references, according to religious literature or according to a guru and that again puts you to sleep. So when there is a challenge of life, if it is pleasurable you pursue it, which is also a way of putting oneself to sleep, because the more pleasure you have the more dull you become. When the challenge of life is painful what happens? You avoid it, which again dulls the mind; you avoid it through various channels. So, constantly, when there is a challenge which demands earnest attention, clear perception, a challenge which may entail pain or pleasure, either we refuse it or identify ourselves with it to such an extent that we put ourselves to sleep. That is the ordinary process and it is only at very, very rare moments that we are awake. It is in those moments that there is no dream. In those moments when you are fully awake there is neither experience nor accumulation of experience. You are just awake and therefore the dreamer is not dreaming.

Now, what is the significance of dreams? Surely, it is this, is it not? The conscious mind, during the day, is actively engaged in either earning money, doing routine work, learning, or is occupied with some technical job. So, the conscious mind during the day, is actively busy with superficial things such as going to the temple, going to the office, having a quarrel with the wife or husband, thinking, reading, avoiding, enjoying; it is constantly active. When

the mind goes to sleep what happens? The superficial mind is fairly quiet. But consciousness is not just the superficial layer. Consciousness has many, many layers, you don't have to be told what they are: hidden motives, pursuits, anxieties, fears, frustrations and so on. And these layers of consciousness can and do project themselves into the conscious mind and when it wakes up it says: 'I have had a dream.' In other words, the conscious mind is so occupied with daily activities, daily anxieties, daily fears that it is incapable of receiving intimations and hints during the day. Each of the many layers has its own consciousness and when the superficial mind becomes quiet the layers project themselves on the superficial mind and then you dream.

There are of course superficial dreams and dreams which have real significance. The superficial dreams are the dreams created by the bodily response; indigestion, overeating etc. So, we need not consider those. Other dreams are the intimations of the deeper layers of consciousness. Now, when you dream, what happens? It often happens that as you dream interpretation is taking place. I do not know if you have noticed it. That is, dreams are really, are they not, symbols, images, pictures which the conscious mind translates and says 'I have dreamt this or that.' Symbols and hidden motives which when projected into the conscious are translated into symbols which convey a significance to you when you wake up. And when you dream, when you say on waking 'I have had a dream,' immediately you want to interpret it. If you are at all aware you want to know what it means. Now there is the luxury of going to a psychoanalyst, the dream expert and he will translate your dream for you after a very difficult process taking many months

and costing a great deal of money. But most of us have not the money, fortunately, and we are not near any psychoanalyst.

Psychoanalysts are the new priests in the modern world. They have also their own jargon and they exploit you and you exploit them.

But, surely there is a different way of understanding. When you yourself interpret the dream, who is the interpreter? You have had a dream during the night, it has some significance, it is not just a superficial dream, it is a dream which has some worth, some meaning. Now, you want to understand it, which means you want to translate it, you want to go into it. Now, how do you understand a dream? You try to pursue it and find out its significance and what happens? You try to interpret it. You are interpreting it and therefore you, being the conditioned, active superficial mind, are not able to pursue it, understand it. You can only translate it, interpret it according to your like and dislike. But the dream gives you very little of its significance, its meaning. If you pursue your dream you will see what I mean, because you, the interpreter, are very anxious to find out what it means; therefore you are agitated; therefore you cannot understand it. But if the interpreter is fully alert yet passive, then the dream reveals its significance. That is the only way of dealing with dreams. The conscious mind wants to understand the significance of the dream which is the intimation of the many layers of consciousness; so if the dreamer is passively alert, quiet, then the dream begins to yield its significance. But if you pursue it and say, 'I must understand it', the conscious mind becomes agitated and translates the dream according to its conditioning. Therefore it can never understand it. So, how the dreamer, the interpreter, regards the dream is of the highest

importance.

Then there is another problem. The other problem is, as the interpreter, the dreamer is constantly unaware, how can it be possible to free thought from all dreams, so that there will be no interpreter. That is, why should the mind, the conscious mind, always be dreaming? Why should you have to go through these dreams and all the bother of interpretation, and the anxiety on the part of the interpreter? Is there any way of not dreaming at all? Because the moment the interpreter, the dreamer, intervenes in the understanding of the significance of the dream, he is bound to misinterpret it. He can only translate according to his own conditioning which is always pleasurable and therefore he avoids anything that is painful. Is there not a way of transcending all dreams, because dreams, as I said, are intimations given by the many, many layers of consciousness to the superficial layer, of what they want, what they desire, what their intentions are.

So, the problem is then, how to transcend, how to understand fully, deeply, all the intimations of the various layers of consciousness so that you don't have to wait for the night to have a dream and then translate it and all the rest of it. Is it possible to understand the whole content of consciousness, to free it so that it need not project itself upon the superficial mind when asleep? Is it possible to empty the whole of consciousness so that the conscious mind understands fully? The superficial then is the profound. There are many layers of consciousness and when one of these layers projects upon the conscious, superficial layer, its intimations, which the conscious mind calls dreams, then the conscious mind tries to interpret them and suffers all the anxiety of interpretation. I

do not know if you have gone through that.

Now, my question is: is it possible for the conscious mind to be so alert, so passively aware during the day that all the intimations are translated as they arise? In other words, can you be so consciously, so choicelessly aware - the moment you choose, you become the interpreter - can you be so passively aware that all the layers of consciousness are giving you their intimations all the time, so that all of consciousness is one whole without layers? This is possible only when the conscious mind is not battling with problems, when the conscious mind is not made still, but is still. If you will experiment you will see how extraordinarily interesting this is. When the conscious mind is quiet it may be doing superficial things but its quietness is not disturbed by the superficial activities. Then you will see that the more you are aware, the more you are passively observant, negatively watchful, choicelessly alert, the more the contents of the unconscious, of the many layers, comes to the surface. You don't have to interpret them because the moment they arise they are being understood. If you experiment, you will feel an extraordinary freedom because your whole being, your consciousness, which now is broken up, becomes integrated. There is no longer any struggle in your consciousness, it is therefore love, it is completely whole, unbroken. Surely, that is freedom, and all those deep hidden layers of consciousness are out, open, free and therefore there is no necessity for dreams.

When therefore there are no dreams, consciousness can penetrate deeper and deeper into itself, for dreams are an indication of disturbance. But when there is no disturbance and the body is



very quiet during sleep, when the mind is still, when the conscious mind is comparatively still, you will find upon waking, you had not dreamt, but that a renewal has taken place, a renewal which is constantly going on because there is always an ending.

The farmer, the toiler, tills the field in the spring time. Then he sows, then he harvests and allows the field to lie fallow during the winter months. That fallowness of the soil is regeneration because it is exposed to the sun, the snow, the storm. It renews itself. So, similarly when the conscious mind has struggled, sown, harvested, it must lie fallow. Such fallowness is its own creativeness. It renews itself and this can be done every day, not only at the end of the season.

Now, when you have a problem you struggle with it and you don't end it, you carry it over to the next day. But if you end it then, that is, if you live the four seasons in one day, then when you wake up you find there has been a renewal, a freshness, a newness which you have never felt before. It is not the renewal of desire, the renewal of your problems, of property, marriage and all that kind of thing, but the renewal to face things anew. So, dreams have an extraordinary significance. But their significance is not understood if there is the interpreter and as there is the interpreter he is always translating the dream according to his conditioning. So, is it possible to remove the interpreter? It is possible only when the conscious mind is active, yet passive, when it is passively aware. Then, in that new awareness, in that passive, choiceless state, the whole content of the many layers of consciousness is understood, because that consciousness is no longer broken up but is whole and integrated; it is free; and it can renew itself constantly and face

anew everything that confronts it.

Question: We see the significance of what you say, but there are many important problems which demand immediate attention, such as the struggle between capital and labour.

Krishnamurti: We all know that there are immediate problems which need immediate solutions and answers. That is obvious, especially in a society which is chaotic, confused, which is the result of industrialization and so on. Those problems demand immediate attention; capital, labour, transportation and all the rest of it. Now what is it that we are saying that is so impracticable, that cannot deal with the immediate problems? That is the implication in this question. That is, the questioner says 'yes', I agree with what you say but how am I to solve the 'immediate problems'. The implication is that he has not found in what we have been saying any application to the immediate problems. He does not know how to deal with the problems which demand immediate attention.

Now, either we deal with the problems from the point of view of reform or from the point of view of right thinking. If I am dealing with problems merely from the point of view of reforming, those reforms need further reforming, but if I am dealing with problems from the point of view of right thinking, then I shall be able to deal with them directly. So, we are not concerned with reforms, are we? It is very important to decide this for yourself because you want reform, there is an urgency to remedy the lack of food, to abolish child-marriage, to permit widow remarriage; you know all the immediate problems. Are you dealing with them with the mentality of the reformer, whose attitude is entirely different from that of the man who wants to deal with the entire problem of

human existence? To be concerned merely with reform, is one way of dealing with problems. Then you are not concerned with the purpose of man, you are merely concerned with the immediate problem of man, and that is all you care about. That is the attitude of the politician. So, such an attitude only leads to confusion, more confusion, more struggle, more misery which is evident in society at the present time. Or, are you looking at problems like starvation, nationalism, economic frontiers, and at our daily existence which creates innumerable problems, from the point of view of a man who is seeking for the whole meaning of existence? These two points of view are diametrically opposed.

So, from which point of view did you put this question? Please don't answer, there are too many people. If you are dealing from the point of view of the reformer then there is no answer because you have to reform, you have to compromise with the left and with the right, and with corruption, which means that you are also partly corrupted and so on and so on. It is like a man who says: If I do not have an army my country will be overrun by the enemy; but I also believe in pacifism, I believe in brotherhood. He is really a reformer. He has compromised because he says, if I don't have an army somebody will come and conquer me'. So, he creates an army, he participates in war because the very existence of an army is an indication of preparation for war and all the problems connected with the results of war and so on.

Now, similarly when you deal with the problem of labour and capital what is involved in it? The capitalist is a thoroughgoing exploiter. He will pay the least to get the most, which we all know, but if the labourer can get to the top, he will do exactly the same,

for everything is controlled by the State and you are directed to work whether you like it or not. So, the struggle between capital and labour is a problem of power. The capitalist seeks his own security, his own safety, you know the whole business of his exploitation, and the labourer has to organize to protect himself from the ruthlessness of the man above. Therefore there are strikes, unions and so on.

So, are you approaching life from the point of view of the reformer, that is doing patch work, or are you approaching it from a revolutionary point of view, which means that you have an idea you want to carry through? Then you are not concerned with human struggle, human existence, but only with the system and therefore you believe the system will benefit man. So, you are more interested in the system than in man. Or, are you approaching the whole problem of human existence, and not merely the struggle between capital and labour, which is the struggle between man and man, between wife and husband, between neighbour and neighbour, between group and group, between one organization and another organization? Are you approaching the problem in order to understand the true meaning of conflict, pain and suffering in man? If your approach is comprehensive, integrated, whole, then you will have an answer which is real. But if you are merely approaching the problem from the point of view of a theoretical revolutionary with a system and according to a pattern, then surely you will not solve the human ailment, nor will the reformer, the socially active person who wants to alter things to fit them into his pattern, into his framework. His reforms will have to be reformed because the reformer is not tackling the fundamental issues of the

mind.

The immediate can only be understood, if we understand the timeless. The man who is concerned with the immediate can never understand the profound, for man is not merely the immediate. If he is seeking an answer to his problems in terms of time - the question implies that the problem must be settled the day after tomorrow - then such a man is not concerned with the real issues and problems, the psychological issues and problems of man; he will say: I am not concerned with your psychological problems. All I want is to feed the millions and therefore I am going to pursue ruthlessly the feeding of the millions even if I should fail to feed any. Surely there is a different approach to this problem, - the problem of necessities which are food, clothing and shelter and other psychological factors, - one which does not relate it to any particular group or system. Taking man as a whole is what very few people want to do, because they are all concerned with the immediate: immediate desires, immediate fulfillments, immediate passions. So, most of us are really concerned with the immediate. Most of us are politicians and not real seekers wishing to find out the truth of existence. Most of us want to compromise, most of us want easy settlements. But those people are not going to be the saviours of man. The man who will save humanity is he who profoundly understands himself in relation to society, in relation to his wife, to the nation, to the group and who by transforming himself in relationship brings a new understanding which helps to clarify the significance of society and its struggles.

Question: Are we not shaped by circumstances? Are we not really the creatures of our senses?

Krishnamurti: Again this is an enormous problem because the implications are enormous in a question of this kind. One implication is that matter is in movement within itself and therefore control of circumstances is essential, is all important. The other conception is that idea moves upon matter and therefore shapes matter. It is the religious conception. The materialistic conception is that matter is in movement within itself and produces the idea and therefore one must control circumstances, therefore the individual is not important. Whereas according to the other, the religious conception, idea shapes matter, that is God, or what you will, controls and shapes matter and therefore there is absolute value, absolute virtue, and it is the reality. The materialist, the socialist, the extreme leftist say that there is no such thing as absolute value; man is merely the product of environment and he changes his values according to environment and therefore environment controls and shapes him according to a system. These theorists force him, put him into a straight jacket of thought so that he would function effectively as a citizen in a mechanized society and so the individual is not at all important because he is merely matter to be shaped.

Don't take sides. I am not taking sides. To the rightist the individual is important only so long as there is no crisis. When there is a war, the individual is no longer important. He is brought into the war and shot. So, both the left and the right meet in moments of crisis, and the individual is sacrificed. This is what is happening in the world today. Though we believe in absolute value and that man, the individual is the sacred expression of that value, he is nevertheless sacrificed, he is regimented, he is directed in

moments of crisis as a war or other national disaster. To the leftist, man is not important, the individual is not important, he may eventually become an important entity, but in the meantime he must be controlled, shaped. Now, the leftist starts with his theory, his system; and the rightist denies all that the leftist says, and believes that God has created him. He has his bible and the leftist has his bible. So, both are approaching the problem with a conditioned mind, conditioned by Marx or by the Bible, Bhagavad Gita, or what you will.

If I want to find out where the truth is, how do I start? It is a fact that I am the result of my environment as you also are, obviously. You are the creature of your senses because after all you are a Hindu or a Christian or a Mussalman, you are the result of your environment. You have been told to believe in God and you believe in God. You go to the temple or not according to your conditioning. Whether left or right you are conditioned, which implies environment has shaped your mind. So you are partly, not wholly, a result of your environment; and in order to find out what is true you must go deeper and deeper into the whole problem of the senses and not categorically stop at a certain point.

So, you have to experiment with yourself to find out how far your thinking, your feeling is merely sensory, your values sensate, and not accept, as the rightists do, that God is absolute, and then try to find the absolute. If you do merely accept, you are exactly like the leftist who denies, because you are then merely experiencing, living, according to your conditioning. You will not find the truth, because you have arbitrarily decided in advance that there is or there is not. Whereas if you want to find the truth you must

obviously begin with the senses because that is all you know. You can speculate on all the rest but in understanding the sensate values you can go deeper and deeper into the whole problem of consciousness. You don't take anything for granted, nor accept anything in order to believe. You begin experimenting and then you will find for yourself whether you are merely the result of the environmental influences or if you are the idea moving upon matter. You will find that it is neither, but that it is something else. When you put it as matter moving upon idea or idea moving upon matter, then they are put as opposites, as antithetical. As I said before, if you approach a problem from the point of view of the opposite, then the opposite contains its own opposite. After all when the left and the right are treated as opposites the left is the continuation of the right; it is the denial of the right only at certain points but it is nevertheless the continuation of the right.

So, in order to understand this problem you cannot approach it either from the left or from the right; acceptance of the left or of the right is a denial of truth. Food, clothing and shelter are sensate values; and your thinking is obviously sensate and so are your feelings. From there you can proceed and then going deeper into the psychological process you will find there comes a silence, there comes an absolute, not a relative tranquillity. It is not sensory, not sensate, it is not self-induced. In that silence you will find truth when the mind is really still, - not only when the superficial layer of consciousness, but the whole consciousness is still, when it is not inquiring, when it is not seeking, - when it is not urged by desires. Then in that real tranquillity, which is not induced, which is not invited, you will find the Truth, but when you accept either



the left or the right surely you cannot find the Truth of anything.

Acceptance is the very denial of Truth.

December 21, 1947

## **MADRAS 11TH PUBLIC TALK 28TH DECEMBER, 1947**

This will be the last Sunday talk. Though I have gone over many subjects and approached our human problem from different points of view I think it may be just as well if I made, not exactly a summary, but a general survey of what we have been discussing during the last ten weeks. Naturally I cannot do it in detail and, as time is limited, I will naturally have to be very concise but I hope that those of you who have followed these discussions and talks will understand their true significance rather than accept merely the words.

We must have realized not only through newspapers but through our everyday contact with life, with our neighbours, our friends, our families, the increasing confusion and misery all around us, politically, socially, religiously; and the same confusion exists in our relationship with each other, that is, with society. So, how are we to understand this increasing confusion and misery and bring order and happiness? I think that is what every thoughtful man is concerned with; I am not talking of those people who are concerned with systems, for they are really not thoughtful people at all; they want to impress upon people a system by means of which happiness or order could be brought about, they are concerned with systems and not with human beings. So, we are not discussing systems or organizations, but how to bring about order in this mad chaotic world.

To go far you must begin very near, mustn't you? You must begin with what is very close, which is yourself. That is, we see

this chaos about us, mounting disaster, mounting wars and terrible cruelties and misery; how are we to solve these? It is a vast confused puzzle and where must we begin to bring order and happiness? Surely with yourself, mustn't you? You are the focal point of all this chaos, surely; if we understand that, we will begin with ourselves, each one of us, I with myself and you with yourself. But, somehow we fail to realize this basic fact, that we are the important keystone in the whole structure of society.

What is the relationship between yourself and the misery, the confusion in and around you? Surely this confusion, this misery did not come into being by itself. You and I have created it, not a capitalist or a communist or a fascist society, but you and I have created it in our relationship with each other. What you are within has been projected without, onto the world; what you are, what you think and what you feel, what you do in your everyday existence, is projected outwardly and that constitutes the world. If we are miserable, confused, chaotic within, by projection that becomes the world, that becomes society, because the relationship between yourself and myself, between myself and another is society - society is the product of our relationship - and if our relationship is confused, egocentric, narrow, limited, national, we project that and bring chaos into the world.

So, what you are, the world is. So your problem is the world's problem. Surely, this is a simple and basic fact, is it not? In our relationship with the one or the many we seem somehow to overlook this point all the time. We want to bring about alteration through a system or through a revolution in ideas or values, based on a system, forgetting that it is you and I who create society, who

bring about confusion or order by the way in which we live. So, we must begin near, that is, we must concern ourselves, with our daily existence, with our daily thoughts and feelings and actions which are revealed in the manner of earning our livelihood and in our relationship with ideas or beliefs. This is our daily existence, is it not? We are concerned with livelihood, getting jobs, earning money, we are concerned with the relationship with our family or with our neighbours, and we are concerned with ideas and with beliefs. Now, if you examine our occupation, it is fundamentally based on envy, it is not just a means of earning a livelihood. Society is so constructed that it is a process of constant conflict, constant becoming; it is based on greed, on envy, envy of your superior; the clerk wanting to become the manager, which shows that he is not just concerned with earning a livelihood, a means of subsistence but with acquiring position and prestige. This attitude naturally creates havoc in society, in relationship, but if you and I were only concerned with livelihood we would find out the right means of earning it, a means not based on envy. Envy is one of the most destructive factors in relationship because envy indicates the desire for power, for position and it ultimately leads to politics; both are closely related; the clerk when he seeks to become a manager, becomes a factor in the creation of power politics which produce war. So, he is directly responsible for war.

What is our relationship based on? The relationship between yourself and myself, between yourself and another - which is society - what is it based on? Surely not on love, though we talk about it. It is not based on love because if there were love there would be order, there would be peace, happiness between you and

me. But in that relationship between you and me there is a great deal of ill will which assumes the form of respect. If we were both equal in thought, in feeling, there would be no respect, there would be no ill will, because we would be two individuals meeting, not as disciple and teacher, nor as the husband dominating the wife, nor as the wife dominating the husband. When there is ill will there is a desire to dominate which arouses jealousy, anger, passion, all of which in our relationship create constant conflict from which we try to escape, and this produces further chaos, further misery.

Now as regards ideas which are part of our daily existence, beliefs and formulations, are they not distorting our minds? For, what is stupidity? Stupidity is the giving of wrong values to those things which the mind creates, or to those things which the hands produce. Most of our thoughts spring from the self-protective instinct, do they not? Our ideas, oh, so many of them, do they not receive the wrong significance which they have not in themselves? And therefore, when we believe in any form, whether religious, economic or social, when we believe in God, in ideas, in a social system which separates man from man, in nationalism and so on, surely we are giving a wrong significance to belief, which indicates stupidity, for belief divides people, doesn't unite people. So we see that by the way we live, we can produce order or chaos, peace or conflict, happiness or misery. So, what we have been discussing for the past eleven weeks is directly related to our daily life, to our daily existence and is not theoretical.

To bring order out of this confusion, out of this chaos which we have projected outwardly because inwardly we are chaotic, envious and stupid, is virtue. You can only bring order and peace and

happiness through self-knowledge, and not by following a particular system, either economic or religious. But to know one's self is most difficult. It is very easy to follow a system for you don't have to think very much, you give yourself over to a party, either the left or the right, and thereby close your thinking process. To be aware of the activities of your daily existence requires thoughtfulness, intelligence, awareness which very few people are willing to practice. They would rather reform society than understand their own activity, their own thought, their own feelings, yet it is they who really create misery and havoc. Self-knowledge is not the knowledge of some supreme self, which is still within the field of the mind, but the knowledge of yourself in your daily action, what you do every day, what you feel, what you think every moment. This requires extraordinary alertness, does it not? There must be constant alertness to pursue every thought, every feeling and to know all their contents. From self-knowledge comes right thinking, therefore, right action which is really extremely simple when you are aware, but extremely difficult when you talk theoretically about it. Most of us are so callous about everything, about life itself, that we would rather discuss what is self-knowledge than be aware. Yet it is only through right thinking which comes through self-knowledge, the knowledge of everything we do, think and feel, that we can bring order and peace, and not in any other way. No system of philosophy, either of the left or of the right, can bring order, peace and happiness to men because it is you and I who have created this misery, through our everyday stupidity, ill will and envy. These things cannot be eradicated until we understand them. We can only understand them

as they function within us, in you and in me, and not by theoretically reading about them in any book; and through understanding them we will bring virtue into being and virtue gives freedom and that freedom is Truth.

I have many questions to answer. I have chosen seven as representing the many and I am going to try to answer these seven questions as quickly and as concisely as possible.

Question: Can an ignorant man with many responsibilities understand and so carry out your teachings without the aid of another, without resorting to books and to teachers?

Krishnamurti: Now, can understanding be given to another? Can you be taught how to love? Can you go to a guru, a teacher, or read a book and learn how to love, how to be kind, how to be generous and how to understand? Can you follow another and be free? Can you accept authority and yet be creative? Surely creativeness comes only when there is freedom, inward freedom, when there is no fear, when there is no imitation, when there is no submission to authority whether of a sacred book or of a teacher. Now, who is the ignorant man? Surely the ignorant man is the man who does not know himself, and not the man who is not learned; The learned man is really stupid in his ignorance because he relies on knowledge, books, outward authority to give him understanding, but understanding comes only through self-knowledge which is the true state of yourself, the state of your total process and not only one part of your being, either the material or the psychological for both these act and react upon each other. The study of yourself, which is self-knowledge, is extraordinarily arduous as it demands constant awareness which is not

introspection because introspection is merely the improvement of the self, the self which is functioning every day. Improvement implies condemnation and depression; that is introspection, but awareness is totally different. Awareness can only come into being when you are not condemning when you are alertly passive. So, self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom.

Now, the questioner asks: Can an ignorant man, with many responsibilities, understand and carry out your teachings without the aid of a teacher? Obviously, if you accept authority there cannot be understanding, for authority is ever blinding whether it be outward authority or inward authority; and to have many responsibilities implies relationship, does it not? And relationship is a process of self-revelation. Only in relationship can you find out. There is no such thing as living in isolation. Even the man who seeks to avoid the world and run away from the world, is in relationship with others, because to exist is to be related and in the relationship between you and me, between yourself and another, the activities of the self are revealed.

Surely in order to know yourself, to know what you think, what you feel, you don't have to go to a guru. Though it is arduous no one can help you to follow out every thought, every feeling and to realize their implications and their significance. You and I can discuss it, go into it significantly, with complete concentration, with interest, but because you are not really interested, you will go to someone else to find out how to think, how to discover and that is the misfortune. The moment you are interested, the moment you recognize your responsibility in relationship then that very process begins to unwrap the ways of your own thoughts and actions. So,



the problem is not whether you should read books or go to teachers but whether, very simply, you are aware of what you are doing, of what you are thinking, when you put on your sacred threads, your namams, when you talk to your servants; aware of the way you treat your wives, your children and your neighbours. Be aware every moment and see what happens. You will see that when you are aware, there will be conflict, greater conflict than before; because you then begin to see the significance of your actions, of your thoughts and feelings, and this will bring you further misery, and as we want to avoid suffering we turn to gurus, books, which are merely escapes and therefore create further misery in us and therefore in society.

So, what is important is to be creative but creativeness does not come through imitation, creativeness comes into being only when there is freedom. Surely you do have ideas and feelings at moments when you are not imitating, when you are quiet and when you are silent. There is creativeness only when there is cessation of fear, when you are not concerned about your own activities, about your miseries and misfortunes. Only in that state of freedom from your daily existence, your daily worries, is there that creativeness, and that creativeness cannot be learned, it comes into being when your daily problems are understood, but you cannot understand them through a book, through a teacher but only by coming into direct contact with them, by being aware of them every minute of the day. This is very arduous, it requires swiftness of thought. But as most of us are dull, as most of us are merely imitating, copying tradition or following a system, our minds are sluggish. To break away from those things which make us dull requires direct action;

but as we have committed ourselves, it is very difficult because it means more disruption and as we are unwilling to face it we turn to books, to teachers who will gratify us, who will pacify us in our dullness. So, understanding comes only through self-knowledge and not through a book or through a teacher.

Question: What is the awareness that you speak of? Is it the awareness of the supreme universal consciousness?

Krishnamurti: Surely, Sirs, to be aware means very simply, to be aware of yourself in relation to your neighbour, to the flower, to the bird, to the tree; to be aware of your own thoughts, feelings and actions, because you must begin very near, mustn't you, to go very far. You cannot be aware of something that you don't know; you talk about universal consciousness, but you don't know it. If you do know it, surely it is not the Real. You have learned of it in a book or you have been told about it. It is still within the field of the mind, of the memory; you want to begin with the most difficult and far away and not with the near, because it is much easier to be aware of God, for you can lose yourself in an idea, in imagination. But to be aware of your own daily acts, daily feelings, daily thoughts is much more painful and so you would rather be aware of something far away than of the things very close, such as your relationship with your wife or with your neighbour. You can be aware of love ideologically for it is the farthest and the most difficult thing. But to be aware, in our relationship how cruel we are, thoughtless, callous, self-enclosed, is very painful, and being conscious of the immediate pain which direct awareness brings, we would rather think of, or be aware of the universal consciousness, whatever that may mean, which again is a form of escape from the

actual, from what is.

So, the awareness I am speaking of, is the awareness of what is, what is actually, directly in front of you, because in understanding what is, which is the very nearest, you can reach great depths, great heights; then there is no deception, then there is no self-illusion, because in the understanding of what is there is transformation. You will find that awareness is not condemnation or identification but a process of understanding of what is. If you condemn, if you identify, you stop thinking, do you not? If you want to understand your child and if you condemn him you don't understand him. Similarly if you have a feeling, which is 'what is', don't condemn it, don't identify it with yourself, don't cling to it but be aware of it; and by becoming aware of it you will find that you can go deeper and deeper into it and therefore discover the whole content of what is.

Awareness of what is, must be choiceless: less which again is very arduous. Awareness is that state of choicelessness, because if you want to understand something you must not condemn or identify, it must tell you its story. After all, if you observe a child, if you want to understand him, if you want to study him, his ways, his mannerisms, his idiosyncrasies, his moods, you can only do that if you don't condemn him or identify yourself with him, saying: this is my child. Condemnation, justification or identification prevents understanding and to be aware of the whole total process of what is, there must be choiceless observation. You do just that when you are interested in something, when you are vitally interested in pursuing something, in understanding something; you are not criticizing, you are not condemning, you give all your mind and

heart to it. But, unfortunately we are trained educationally and religiously to condemn and not to understand. After all, condemnation is very easy, but to understand is very arduous, understanding requires intelligence, condemnation does not demand any intelligence at all, condemnation is a form of self-protection just as identification is. When you condemn you protect yourself, but if you want to understand what is, condemnation is a barrier. If you want to understand the state of the world as it is now, its appalling misery, surely it is no good condemning it, you must investigate it, you must observe from different points of view, from the psychological, economic, and so on. It is a total process and to understand the total process you cannot condemn it in part. We condemn because it is so easy to condemn, while to be aware and to pursue all the implications requires a great deal of patience, a capacity to penetrate and to be still. You understand only when there is stillness, when there is silent observation, passive awareness. Then the problem yields you its significance. So, the awareness of which I am speaking is awareness of what is, and not of something which is the invention of the mind. Being aware implies awareness of the mind's activities in which are included ideas, beliefs but also the tricks which the mind plays upon itself. So, be aware of what is, without condemnation, without justification or identification, then you will see that there is a deeper understanding which resolves our problems.

Question: I am very interested in your teachings; I would like to spread them. What is the best way to do it?

Krishnamurti: Many things are involved in this question. Let us look at it. Propaganda is a lie because mere repetition is not Truth.

What you can repeat is a lie. Truth cannot be repeated for Truth can only be experienced directly; mere repetition is a lie because repetition implies imitation. That which you repeat may be Truth to someone but when you repeat it, it ceases to be Truth. Propaganda is one of the terrible things in which we are caught. You know something or you don't know. Usually you have read something in some books and you have heard some talk and you want to spread it. Have words any significance besides the verbal meaning? So what you are spreading is really words and do words or terms, resolve our problems? Say, for instance, you believe in reincarnation; you don't know why you believe but you want to spread that belief. What are you spreading in fact? Your belief, terms, words, your convictions which are still within the field, within the layer of verbal expression.

We think in words, in terms, we seek explanations which are still only words and we are caught in this monstrous lie, believing that the word is the thing. Surely, the word God is not God, but you believe that the word is God and that therefore you can spread it. Please see this. To you the word has become important, and not Reality. So you are caught in the verbal level and what you want to spread is the word. That means you will catch what I am saying in the net of words and so cause a new division between man and man. Then you will create a new system based on Krishnamurti's words which you the propagandist will spread among other propagandists who are also caught in words and thereby what have you done? Whom have you helped? No, Sirs, that is not the way to spread. So don't try what is stupid, what is the height of folly - to spread someone else's experience.

If you experience something directly, it would be experience not based on belief; because what you believe you experience and therefore it is not real experience but only conditioned experience; there can be experience, the right kind of experience only when thinking ceases, but that experience cannot be spread as information to clear the mess. But, if you begin to understand simple things like nationalism, surely you can discuss it with others, in order to make it known as a poison which is destroying man. Sirs, you are not aware of the enormous calamity that lies in wait for you and for the whole world because this poison is spreading. You are nationalists, you are Hindus against Pakistan, against England, against Germany, against Russia, and so on. So, nationalism is a poison, is it not? You can understand that very easily, because it divides men. You cannot be a nationalist and talk of brotherhood; these terms are contradictory. That also you can understand, that you can talk about. But you don't want to talk about that because that would mean a change of heart within yourself, which means that you must cease to be a Hindu with your beliefs, ceremonies and all the rubbish that is around you. We don't talk about nationalism because we might be asked if we are free of it ourselves. Not being free, we evade it and try to discuss something else. Surely you can talk about something which you live and which you are doing every day, and that is what I have been talking about - your daily actions, your daily thoughts and feelings. My words you cannot repeat; for, if you do, they will have no meaning; but you can talk about the way you live, the way you act, the way you think, from which alone there can be understanding; all that, you can discuss; but there is no use of

groups with presidents and Secretaries and organizations which are terrible things in which you are often caught. Sirs, though you all smile, yet surely you are all caught in these.

I don't think you know how catastrophic the whole situation is in the world now. I don't have to frighten you. You have merely to pick up a newspaper and read about it. You are on the edge of a precipice and you still perform ceremonies, carry on in your stupid ways, blind to what is happening. You can only alter by transformation of yourself and not by the introduction of a new system whether of the left or of the right. In the transformation of yourself is the only hope but you cannot transform yourself, radically, profoundly, if you are above all a Hindu, if you perform ceremonies, if you are caught in the net of organizations.

As it has always been in the past, so also at the present time the salvation of man is in his being creative. You are caught inwardly in belief, in fear and in those hindrances that prevent the coming together of man and man. That is, if I don't know how to love you, how to love my neighbour, my wife, how can there be communion between us. We need communion, not communion between systems but communion between you and me without systems, without organizations and that means we must really know how to love one another, our hearts must be opened to one another, but your hearts cannot be open if you belong to an organization, if you are bound by beliefs, if you are nationalistic, if you are a brahmin or a sudra.

So, you can spread even a tiny part of what I have been talking about, only as you live it. It is by your life that you communicate profoundly, not through words. Words, Sirs, to a serious,

thoughtful man have very little meaning. Terms are of very little significance when you are really seeking Truth, Truth in relationship and not an abstract Truth of valuations, of things, or of ideas. If you want to find the truth of those things verbally, it is of little importance; but words become very important when you are not seeking Truth; then the word is the thing and then the thing catches you. So, if you want to spread these teachings, live them, and by your life you will be spreading them, you will be communicating them, which is much more true and significant than verbal repetition, for repetition is imitation and imitation is not creativeness and you as an individual must awake to your own conditioning and thereby free yourself and hence give love to another.

Question: Is marriage necessary for women?

Krishnamurti: I don't know why it is necessary for women any more than it is for men. This is really an enormous problem. We will try to tackle it. First of all we are trying to understand the problem, we are not trying to condemn it or identify with it or justify it. We are trying to understand the problem of marriage, in which is implied sexual relationship, love, companionship, communion. Obviously if there is no love, marriage becomes a disgrace, does it not? Then it becomes mere gratification. To love is one of the most difficult things, is it not? Love can come into being, can exist only when the self is absent. Without love, relationship is a pain; however gratifying, or however superficial, it leads to boredom, to routine, to habit with all its implications. Then, sexual problems become all important. In considering marriage, whether it is necessary or not, one must first comprehend



love. Surely, love is chaste, without love you cannot be chaste; you may be a celibate, whether a man or a woman, but that is not being chaste, that is not being pure, if there is no love. If you have an ideal of chastity, that is if you want to become chaste, there is no love in it either because it is merely the desire to become something which you think is noble, which you think will help you to find Reality; there is no love there at all. Licentiousness is not chaste, it leads only to degradation, to misery. So does the pursuit of an ideal. Both exclude love, both imply becoming something, indulging in something and therefore you become important and where you are important, love is not. So, that is one of the problems. Then, if you are not married, consider the difficulties, either for man or woman. Biologically, the woman 'needs' to fulfil herself in a child. When she is deprived of that she is starved, as she is starved when she is deprived of love. And as most women are deprived of love they seek fulfillment in things or in their children. So, children and things become all important to women, whereas the man tries to fulfil himself in work and activity. But is there fulfillment? I hope you are following all this. If I try to fulfil myself through things, through family, through ideas, then family, names, things and ideas become very important. And therefore I give value to things, to relationship, to ideas. I give them a greater value than they have because they are important to me. I introduce wrong laws, wrong methods, wrong values instead of finding out if there is fulfillment.

What do we mean by fulfillment? As long as we are seeking fulfillment there is fear, is there not? I want to fulfil myself in my family, in my name, in my continuity or in things or in ideas. So,

there is always a desire for fulfillment where there is frustration. I want to fulfil myself because I am aware that I am not fulfilling myself. The fact is I am not fulfilling. I am empty, I would like to fill that emptiness. So, what happens? I merely pursue fulfillment without understanding 'what is'. If I understood what is, which is my emptiness, my hollowness, my shallowness, my pettiness, then I could transform that. There is a tremendous revolution in that. But, if I merely pursue fulfillment, then there is misery because I seek fulfillment in so many ways, which is merely a continuation of my own emptiness. So, that is one of the problems.

Then there is the problem of creativeness which is not merely the breeding of children. Sirs, a man who is happy inwardly, who is creative, does not bother whether he is married or unmarried, he is not seeking fulfillment, he is not escaping through passion, through lust. We cease to be creative when we are imitative, when we are merely functioning according to the response of memory. The response of memory is generally called thinking but such thinking is merely a response of the framework of references which is memory, and that is not real thinking. There is real thinking only when there is no response to memory. In that passive alert awareness, there is creativeness. When you are in that state, then life with all its passions, with all its desires, fades away which does not mean that you cease to love, on the contrary.

Sirs, in order to communicate with another there must be love. It is because we have not that love that all these problems arise: whether I should or should not marry, whom should I marry, the sexual problem, creativeness and so on. But unfortunately, love is something you cannot learn, it is something which cannot be

translated. It comes into being when you have no problem. Have you not found yourselves walking along the streets sometimes, looking at the stars, looking at the sky, or the sunset and feeling happy without knowing why? At such times you want to put your arm around another, you are really in communion with man. But unfortunately, we are so occupied with our own thoughts and problems and fears and our envy, that we have no time to be in communion. You don't know your wife, you don't know your husband or your children. You may have children but there is no love, because you and your wife are isolated. You are hiding behind a wall of your own making and without breaking down that wall, there cannot be communion and to commune there must be love. Without love, mere search for chastity, celibacy, is unchaste. When there is love there is chastity, purity, there is incorruptibility.

Question: I have listened to what you have been saying and I feel that to carry out your teachings I must renounce the world I live in.

Krishnamurti: Sir, you cannot renounce the world, can you? What is the world? The world is made up of things, relationships and ideas. How can you give up things? Even if you give up your house you will still have a 'kurtha'. You may renounce your wife but you will still be in relation with someone, with the milkman, for instance, or the man who gives you food. And you cannot renounce belief, can you? I wish you would. Begin there, if you must renounce something, renounce the wrong valuations which you have given to everything. Wrong valuations create havoc and it is from these wrong valuations which cause misery that you want to escape. You don't want to understand that you are giving wrong

values. You want to escape from the result of wrong values but if you understood the world, which is - ideas, relationship, things - and their true significance, then you would not be in conflict with the world. You cannot withdraw from the world, to withdraw means isolation and you cannot live in isolation. You can live in isolation only in an asylum, but not by renouncing the world. You can only live truly happily with the world when you are not of the world, which means you don't give wrong values to the things in the world. This can happen only when you understand yourself the giver of wrong values. Sirs, it is like a stupid man trying to renounce stupidity. He will still be stupid, he may try to become clever but he will remain stupid. But if he understood what stupidity is, that is, himself, surely then he would reach great heights. Then he would have wisdom. It is not by renouncing that you can find Reality. By renouncing you escape into illusion; you do not discover that which is true. So, what I have been saying is that one must give right values to things, to relationship, to ideas and not try to escape from the world. It is comparatively easy to go away into isolation, but it is extremely arduous to be aware and to give true values. Sirs, things have no value in themselves. The house has no value in itself but it has the value you give it. If psychologically you are empty, insufficient in yourself, the house becomes very important because you identify yourself with the house, and then comes the problem of attachment and renunciation. It is really stupid, and if you understood your inward nature, your inward hollowness, then the problem would have very little meaning. Everything becomes extraordinarily significant when you are trying to use it to cover up your own loneliness. Similarly with

relationship, with ideas, with belief. So, there is richness only in understanding the significance of what is, and not in running away into isolation.

Question: a) Life hurls at us one problem after another. Will the state of awareness of which you speak, enable us to understand and solve, once and for all, the whole question of problems or have they to be solved one after the other?

Question: b) I feel certain deep urges which need to be disciplined. What is the best way of disciplining them?

Krishnamurti: Sirs, it is a very difficult problem. Those of you who are really earnest must give your mind and heart to it. First of all there are problems one after the other. Life is one constant battle of problems and we want to know how to solve them, how to meet them or how to discipline ourselves in order to resist them. That is the whole problem: How are we to discipline ourselves so as not to let problems affect us, how are we to prevent this constant arising of problems? Can they be cut off at the root once and for all?

So, there are several things involved in this question. You will be pursued by problems, one after the other, with their constant annoyance and pain, constant apprehensions if you don't understand who is the creator of problems. If you understand who is the creator of problems, then naturally you will not deal with the problems one by one; that would be utterly stupid. If I understand the cause and not merely the symptoms, then the symptoms cease to be. Similarly if I understand who is the creator of the problems, then the problems cease to be, then there is no question of tackling first one problem and then another.

Then, there is implied the problem of the thinker and the thought, of the one who disciplines and the one who is disciplined. The thinker, the imitator, the discipliner is trying to discipline his thought. This is one of the problems, and the other is how to resist attack from the outside. So, let us begin with the resistance first.

Do you resist when you understand something? Surely not. Discipline exists only as a measure of resistance; otherwise you don't need discipline at all. If through discipline you can create a certain habit, a certain isolation, a certain enclosure then you think you will no longer be afraid. So, discipline, which is resistance or a means of self-protection exists when there is no understanding. If you understand a problem, then the problem ceases. You don't have to resist it. For example, if you understand why you are arrogant then you don't have to resist arrogance. Your disciplining yourself is again arrogance, pride, the pride of achieving, the pride of becoming, the pride of being somebody, it is the search for power, position. If you understand all of that then you will never resist, and you will not discipline your mind 'not to be arrogant'. So, to understand 'what is', is extremely difficult because to understand what is, there must be no distraction of an opposite; for instance, of humility which is the opposite of arrogance. There must be complete concentration on 'what is'.

So, discipline exists only as a form of resistance. You discipline yourself in order not to be tempted, you discipline yourself against something. But, discipline as a mode of resistance, which is violence, ceases only when you understand it, when you are aware of it, when you don't reject it, when you don't condemn it. You will find that through awareness there comes a discipline which is not

imposed, a discipline of extraordinary intelligence and pliability. A man who resists is really `dead,' he is `enclosed' to a man who is independent and free. So, discipline is resistance, I am using the word to include all modes and practices used for self-protection. Discipline is a form of resistance and where there is resistance, there is enclosure and where there is enclosure there is no understanding, there is no communion. A disciplined man is merely righteous and a righteous man has no love in his heart, he is enclosed within the walls of his becoming.

The other point in this question is whether problems can be solved all at once, in one stroke cut off at the root. But first we must discover who is the creator of problems. If the creator is understood the problems will cease. The creator of the problem is the thinker, is he not? Problems do not exist apart from the thinker, that is obvious, is it not? The thinker is the creator of the problems whether many or one. Now, is the thinker separate from his thoughts? If he is separate, then the problem will continue because he creates the problem, separates himself from it and deals with the problem. But if the thinker is the thought, inseparably, then being the creator, he can begin to solve himself without being concerned with the problem, or with the thought. Now, you think that the thinker is separate from his thought, that is exactly what all your religious books, your philosophies are based on. Is that not so? It does not matter what the Bhagavad Gita says or what any book says. Is the thinker separate from his thought? If he is separate, problems will continue, if he is not, then he can be freed of the source of all problems.

If the thinker is separate from his thoughts, how does he

become separated? Remove the qualities of the thinker, remove his thoughts, where is the thinker? The thinker is not. Remove the qualities of the self which is memory, ambition and so on, where is the self? But if you say the self is not the thinker but some other entity behind the thinker, he is still the thinker, because you have only pushed the thinker further back. Now, why has the thinker separated himself from his thoughts? The thinker cannot be without thought because if there is no thought there is no thinker. Now the thinker has separated himself from the thought for the simple reason that thought can be transformed, can be modified, and so in order to give himself permanency the thinker separates himself from the thought and thereby gives himself permanency. The thought being transient, mutable, can be altered, but the thinker who creates the thought can be permanent. He is the permanent entity, whereas the thought is changeable, it can be changed according to circumstances, according to environmental influences but he the thinker remains. He is the thought and if thought ceases he is not, surely, although all our books say differently. Just think it out for yourself for the first time. Put your books aside, forget your authorities and look at the problem directly. Without the thought the thinker is not and the thinker creates the thought and separates himself from it in order to protect himself; thereby he gives stability, certainty to himself and continuity.

Now, how does the thinker come into being? Obviously through desire. Desire is the outcome of perception, contact, sensation, identification and 'me'. Perception of a car, contact, sensation, desire, identification, and 'I like it', 'I want it'. So, I am the product,



the thinker is the product of desire, and having produced the `I', the `I' separates itself from the thought because it can then transform the thought and yet remain permanent.

So, as long as the thinker is separate from his thought, there will be problems, one after the other, innumerable problems; but if there is no separation, if the thinker is the thought, then what happens? Then the thinker himself undergoes a transformation, a radical, fundamental transformation, and that, as I have said, is meditation. It is self-knowledge, it is all that I have said about the thinker; how he separates himself from the thought and how the thinker has come into being. You can test it for yourself. You don't have to read a sacred book to find out the truth of it. That is the beginning of self-knowledge and from that there comes meditation. Meditation is the ending of thought of the thinker, by not giving significance to the thinker, by not giving continuity to the thinker. The thinker is disciplining his thought, separating himself so as to give continuity to himself through property, through family, through ideas, and as long as the thinker exists there will be problems and it is when the thinker ceases thinking, that meditation begins. Meditation is self-knowledge and without self-knowledge there is no meditation. You will find that if you go into the whole question of self-knowledge which is the beginning of wisdom - not by any practice because practice is merely resistance - you can go deeper and deeper starting with the centre which is the desire creating the `I', the self; and when that self continues in the Atman or higher self it is still the thinker merely pushing further back his permanency. Till you are aware of this whole process there is no ending of the problem. But when you become aware, you will find

that time has ceased - time as memory of the past and the future -  
and that there is the immediate present, the eternal, and in this  
alone is Reality.

December 28, 1947

## **MADRAS 1ST GROUP DISCUSSION 24TH OCTOBER, 1947**

Before we begin to discuss, I would like to say something about the discussion and its purpose. First of all, it is not a club for disputation and argumentation.

In Europe and in America, we had groups of different types of people and we went into things that we thought were very important; we continued such clubs for a couple of months or even sometimes longer. At the end of it, some did understand. Similarly, I hope that during these months or weeks of discussion we will get somewhere.

I feel that each one of us must discover or prepare the field so that Reality comes into being; because, Reality is the only solution of our problems whether economic, social, religious, or of relationship between ourselves. Without the realisation of that, I do not see how any problem in the world can be solved. My intention in holding these discussions is to help each other to realize it. It is going to be very arduous because it requires real revolution in thinking, in all the phases of our life. I feel that it is a matter of life and death. Therefore, before we begin to discuss, we must know our various intentions, that is, the relationship between yourself and myself, I may want to go north and you may want to go south; we may eventually meet because south and north do meet as the earth is round.

We are going to discover what our intentions are during these discussions. So, please bear in mind the importance of relationship between ourselves so that we may both go to the same direction not

compulsorily but naturally, spontaneously.

Before we begin to discuss anything, we ought to know our intention, what it is that we want, or what it is that we are unconsciously, deeply, seeking. If we can find that, our problems become comparatively simple.

Another point in discussion is that I will use words which have meaning to me but not to you. I am using words very carefully because they have a meaning to me, and I use very simple and straight language which I am willing to explain carefully. I do not know if you have ever thought about this. Words have the verbal meaning as well as the nervous response. Take, for example, the word God. It has a verbal as well as a nervous response.

These discussions should not deteriorate into mere argumentation, nor should we indulge in verbal expression. We want to discuss together so that we can see something which is beyond words, beyond emotional, sentimental or intellectual froth. And that can only be done if each one of us is willing to expose himself.

These discussions should give an opportunity to understand ourselves. As it is not questioning and answering, do not put questions and wait for my answer. We travel together on a journey. I may perhaps know a little more than you do. You are also travelling on that road. You do not have to sit on the roadside and know little of the journey. We are making the same journey and discovering together. It is like unfolding a map and seeing the various places and proceeding on the right path. Then, this is a mutual discovery. If we are willing to undertake the journey together, it will be a process of self-discovery and self-

understanding, from which we begin to think rightly and, therefore, act rightly.

## **MADRAS 2ND GROUP DISCUSSION 24TH OCTOBER, 1947**

We have many problems - economic, social, religious and of relationship between one another. The reality of each problem is its own solution. The purpose of our discussions is to discover, or prepare the field, so that Reality comes into being.

Words have a verbal meaning as well as a nervous response and their full significance has to be understood. There has to be self-discovery. Self-understanding alone leads to right thinking and right acting. In discussing, we should become aware of our own ways of thinking. It would then be possible to bring about almost instantaneous perception of truth and to change ourselves radically, fundamentally and immediately.

What are the chief obstacles in the way of understanding? We see things with a bias, at an angle, with a prejudice, with a desire to escape from the problem; there are also subconscious blockages. Our problems are not static but ever-changing; to understand them, we should be as alert as the problems. Therefore, any intellectual, verbal or authoritarian, positive or negative conclusion - which is a picture of the past - is a hindrance to understanding; so also is a hypothesis, working or otherwise. For example, you cannot understand your son if you first discuss with professors and experts, form conclusions, and then look at your son in the light of such conclusions.

To understand a living problem, one should be alert and watchful and must follow the movement of life as quickly and correctly as possible. If you have a ready-made conclusion or

hypothesis, it means that you have not understood life. A conclusion is an impediment as it only remains on the verbal level; but if you see the truth of a matter or if you discover a fact by your own thinking, it is not a conclusion.

## **MADRAS 3RD GROUP DISCUSSION 25TH OCTOBER, 1947**

There are in the world as it exists today, two categories of people, each category with its own way of thinking based on study and experimentation. Both have formed systems of their own, upon which they are working. Ideologically, tremendous efforts are being made to bring you under one or the other of these two:

i) Matter is in movement and therefore creates the idea. Man is only the product of environment and can therefore be compelled or shaped to any form of action. Therefore, any means is justified if it achieves the end in view, and

ii) It is the idea which moves upon matter and controls it. The means and the end will both be of the same kind, i.e., wrong means will mean wrong end and right means right end.

Both these are conclusions and they are therefore bound to retard thinking.

Any conclusion or hypothesis - Individualism or Collectivism, Capitalism or Socialism or Communism, Reincarnation, etc. - is a belief. By accepting a belief, you exclude all other forms of thinking. Belief in God does not mean understanding God. A mind tethered to a belief, hypothesis or conclusion - whether based on its own experience or the experience of others - cannot go far; it is not free but conditioned. Therefore, belief is a hindrance to understanding.

When the mind seeks safety, security - i.e. something concrete on which it can anchor - it has recourse to a conclusion or to a hypothesis. Experimentation does not lead to conclusion; the



experimenter keeps on watching, looking and observing. To understand what is taking place in the experiment, he is in a receptive mood, quiet and sensitive like a photographic plate, without criticising or condemning. So also should be our attitude if we would understand the full significance of a marvellous scene, a picture, or a poem.

Relationship is a living thing and as a living thing it is self-revealing. Yet, as we base it on our beliefs and conclusions, it ceases to be 'living' and becomes a problem. You cannot have vested interests - economic, psychological or spiritual - and at the same time freedom. Awareness of our 'conditioning' or 'blockages' will lead to a sea of troubles. "My son, if you come to serve God, come prepared for temptation". Those who are pursuing Truth will have to meet troubles; it is they who are going to change the world.

## **MADRAS 4TH GROUP DISCUSSION 28TH OCTOBER, 1947**

We discovered that any form of conclusion, right or wrong, immediate or ultimate, now or final, or any form of working hypothesis consciously or unconsciously held, is detrimental to full comprehension or understanding of the whole process of existence. Hindrances are not overcome or broken; but when the mind becomes aware of the hindrances, those hindrances cease to be.

What is awareness? There is objective awareness. Then, there is the emotional response to each other or to truth. Then, there is awareness of ideas, of thinking, conscious or unconscious. It is a widening and deepening grasp of both the conscious and unconscious. It is a clear recognition of what is, not what should be or what, ideologically, should take place. To be aware implies to recognize and to know fully and clearly how the "I" is moving, living and functioning - physically, psychologically, consciously or unconsciously.

Experience and experiencer, thinker and his thoughts, are the same. For example, at the moment of anger, the person who feels angry and his quality of anger are the same. Just afterwards the thinker separates himself from the quality and condemns the quality if unpleasant or identifies himself with the quality if pleasant. This is because the thinker seeks stability or permanency. When this is understood by the mind, this duality is dissolved.

## **MADRAS 5TH GROUP DISCUSSION 30TH OCTOBER, 1947**

It is a realisable fact that one can change radically, fundamentally and immediately. Mere postponement or lengthening of time is not going to bring about a change. It is possible to bring about almost instantaneous perception of what is Truth and Truth is the liberating factor.

To start with, we should be aware of our words, our gestures and our thoughts. The sense of struggle and of not being able to do something creates frustration because there is in your mind an idea of achievement. This means you did not pursue awareness but just stopped there. When there is an idea, let not the mind just stop there, but let it pursue it till the full implications of that idea are understood. For instance, consider nationalism; when you are entrenched in a conclusion called Nationalism, you cannot understand the German or the English. Though we agree with this verbally, we yet continue as before, because our mind is conditioned, i.e., put in a mould socially, economically, and religiously, and it says that we are different from somebody else. Again, we have the desire to identify ourselves with something greater and which is gratifying. On account of a feeling of emptiness, which we dislike, we identify ourselves with a caste or a class, nation, creed or idea which affords security - prestige and position - to us. To dissolve this nationalism in us, we must be aware of the fact that we are national and also that nationalism is detrimental to us. In daily life, most of us do not act up to our intellectual convictions because of our fear to please others, to lose

a position, etc.; they are therefore hypocrites to their relatives and later on to the people at large also. Most of us merely follow an old routine of habitual action and thinking.

## **MADRAS 6TH GROUP DISCUSSION 1ST NOVEMBER, 1947**

A mind which is trained in a pattern, i.e., specially moulded, conditioned, controlled, either in a creed or in a formula or in an idea, can never know itself. Any suppression or control whether right or wrong, is based on a pattern of behaviour; the mind, being thus controlled, is not free. The mind can discover itself only when it is free of control and when there is a certain spontaneity.

Discovery of truth liberates us; we then transform ourselves with joy, clarity and quickness. For example, to find the truth about the need for discipline or otherwise, we must investigate the matter.

Some say that if you do not discipline yourself, there will be confusion. Is there not confusion even though you are disciplined? When you have only directed your attention on a particular thing excluding everything else, you still continue to be confused all round. Discipline means education in a certain pattern, i.e., training the mind positively or negatively to a desired pattern, in order to produce a certain result. A disciplined mind is conditioned and therefore static, and a static mind cannot understand the living problem of life. Similarly, practice cannot lead to understanding. The implications of practice are to repeat over and over again, something like discipline. You cannot concentrate your faculties through any method or through any practice. When you practise, you become automatic and thoughtless; an automatic habit cannot lead to awareness.

Life's problems are dynamic and living; therefore, to understand them, you must have a mind which is also dynamic and not

disciplined. Again, Truth can only come to you, you cannot go to it. It is only when you can go to it that you can discipline yourself to reach it; you can only move from the known to the known and not to the unknown. If the means is 'discipline', the end is bound to be 'disciplined'. Therefore, discipline cannot lead you to freedom. No effort or practice can lead you to understanding. Similarly, freedom is not a gradual process. Understanding cannot be through any process or through gradation which means the employment of time. Time can only produce time, not the timeless. Discipline is mere time and so it cannot lead to the Unknown, the Timeless. When conditioned by a discipline, the mind is insensitive to its problems.

## **MADRAS 7TH GROUP DISCUSSION 4TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

To recognise exactly, to become aware of 'what is' is terribly difficult for most of us. There can be understanding only when there is effortless awareness which happens to every one of us at moments of real thinking. Environment is the past in conflict, in modification, or in conjunction with the present. To understand the present, some psychologists have asserted that we must go to the past; but to understand the past, you must begin with the present and observe the same without condemnation.

Understanding a problem undoes the problem directly and resolves it instantaneously without any postponement. For instance, if I feel that I am responsible for the marriage of my daughter, I can resolve that problem of marriage only when I understand all the implications in it. Understanding is a total responsibility of your entire being, a perception which comes to you of the entire picture and not of a part only.

Understanding cannot come through 'Will'. Will involves desire to achieve a result. In this is implied a practice, a continuity - i.e. a continued exercise, practice or discipline - to strengthen your will to become something. It is an accumulated memory which says that I must discipline myself to achieve or gain something; and accumulated memory is the multiplication of desires.

Understanding is spontaneous. The grandeur of a marvellous scene impinges on your mind, and there is an immediate response without any exertion of desire on your part to look at it and enjoy it. When a mind is used in compulsory attitudes and actions, it gets

worn out at the end of few years; it is made dull. When the mind is dull, it is unwilling to look at 'what is' but wants to change itself into something else, thus bringing another element into the problem.

We do not see things as they are either through fear or through a desire for security, or through expectation; because, if we see, we have to break them up; because immediate action implies danger to us, disturbs us and troubles us. When we are without love, we do not say "We are without love." - which is a fact and may perhaps lead us far when realised - but we say "We must be more kind" or "We must love," which is only a hope. When you feel sorrow you try to explain it away, to comfort yourself by going to the guru or by reading some scriptures. Similarly, joy comes to us unexpectedly; at the moment of joy we have done nothing; immediately when you have felt joy or when the joy is past, you wish to recapture it and it soon goes away. To recognise that you are without love, without sensitivity, demands extreme alertness. The recognition of 'what is' - i.e. to accept and see what you actually are - is in itself a transformation.



## **MADRAS 8TH GROUP DISCUSSION 6TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

Understanding comes with freedom. It is not the result of any desire or will or exertion or accumulated memory, practice or discipline. Therefore, it involves change of will altogether and not merely change in will. Thought which seeks security cannot be transformed by compulsion, and understanding comes voluntarily.

There is chaos and moral degradation in the world, in society, in our Environment because, without understanding, we have directed our will and our activities in a certain direction, seeking, though without success, security in things made either by the hand or by the mind. The world - i.e. ourselves - being in chaos, our values are all broken up and destroyed. How is this chaos to be resolved? The present-day world's tendency is to bring about order, if possible, by reorganising the two values, property and division of peoples - i.e. ownership, capitalism, socialism, communism, nationality, religious divisions and caste distinctions between man and man - without reference to the deeper significance of life. We cling to these two values and give them disproportionate value because, for us, there is not a greater value. Throughout the world, these two values have created extraordinary misery; you are not aware that these have caused misery and conflict, because you are thinking of yourself as somebody else. You do not look at the intrinsic significance of these values, and yet attempt to reorganise them.

Through greed, through fear, through desire for security, you create the society, the state which organises these two values. Property and the divisions between man and man are based on the

desire to be secure. Therefore, the difficulty is not in the property but in the desire to be secure. We are thinking of security always and have been moving from one to another which is considered to give us greater security. Thus, the whole process of our thinking is based on security. You want security because you do not know what you are. You are not willing to face what you are.

Fundamentally, you are uncertain, insecure; therefore, you seek security. Seeking security is an indication that you do not know what you are. If you see and know what you are, perhaps you can bring order. If you are confused, you will only act in a confused manner.

## **MADRAS 9TH GROUP DISCUSSION 8TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

Awareness is not of anything abstract or being aware of Reality, God or Truth; we must be aware of what we are doing, what we are thinking and feeling. Have you ever watched you mind? One thought precipitates on another before the original one is complete. All these thoughts relate either to the past memories or to the hopes of the future. The mind wanders, ceaselessly and restlessly, back to the past or forward to the future. In longing to find out what it is which we are thinking, we find that most of us are merely accepting, not thinking, and automatically responding according to our particular profession or reacting to a particular conditioning.

The world problem is your problem. To understand the world, you must understand yourself. To transform the world, you must regenerate yourself. You cannot change yourself until there is self-knowledge. The mind finds it difficult to know itself because it is full of conclusions and suppositions and because it is disciplined; without understanding the ways of itself, the mind cannot proceed further. The mind has to be aware of its own activities and its own conditioning before it can be free, and understanding can come only when the mind is free.

How can the mind which is restless and going swiftly backwards and forwards, be aware of its activities? Finding itself restless, the mind, without becoming aware of the causes of this restlessness, quickly directs itself along certain channels, chosen patterns, based on gratification; for a split second it remains so, but moves off again. The mind is very active and extraordinarily

complex: there are the conscious layers and the innumerable unconscious layers. To understand any- thing, there must be observation. An object in swift movement can be watched only when the movement is slowed down. The problem therefore is how to slow down the movement of the mind. Without understanding the problem in all its implications, the mind jumps to meet the problem with ready-made answers like the following -

i) Stopping the activity of the mind by force. Then, the mind is 'dead' and not living. Our observation of the 'dead' mind will not help us to understand the mind in movement.

ii) Disciplining, controlling the mind - then, all your energy is taken up with controlling or disciplining, and you do not understand the mind in movement. Discipline implies conformity, practice, habit, which deadens the mind.

iii) Inviting a higher entity or an outside interference - Paramatman, some entity beyond the mind - to come and study the mind. This does not work because it is still the product of the mind and therefore the result of the known. It is only a trick of the mind.

iv) Repetition of particular activities of the mind to enable the mind to watch and understand such activities. Repetition makes the mind automatic, thoughtless and therefore not alert but dull. This does not therefore lead to the understanding of the mind in movement.

v) Various points of view - Each point of view is a preconceived path and is conditioned. The problem will then be translated in terms of that particular point of view only. Therefore, it does not lead to the understanding of the whole.

When any one of the above methods of approach to this

problem is taken up by the mind and pursued to its completion, it is found that it does not lead to the solution of the problem and that each such approach is false. Therefore, the method of approach is more important. Without understanding the problem, the mind rushed off with a prepared answer and, after following it through, realised that it was no answer to the problem. The mind must pursue each thought that arises in it, right through till it is complete - just like following up a stream along its course right up to its source; in that very process, the restless mind is slowed down, it becomes extraordinarily quiet and receptive, and understanding comes. For example, you are listening attentively to me when I describe something which is true because I have experienced it. While listening, your mind has slowed down and remained quiet and receptive.

## **MADRAS 10TH GROUP DISCUSSION 10TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

To bring about order in this confused world, there must be right thinking which will lead to right action. There can be right thinking only when we are aware of the process of our thinking, i.e. when we know what we are thinking, the way we are feeling, etc. We all know how our mind is constantly vagrant and restless and how it is difficult for it to complete any particular thought and follow it out fully, because another thought precipitates itself upon the one which we want to think out. The mind can be understood only when it is slowed down so that each thought, as it arises, can be followed out with care and deep understanding, without effort, without compulsion, without interference and with a sense of freedom; the mind has to dedicate itself to that understanding.

When discussing this problem of slowing down the mind, one suggestion or response after another was made by the mind as to how the mind can be slowed down - i.e. (i) Stopping the mind; (ii) Controlling or disciplining the mind; (iii) Invoking a higher self or an entity beyond the mind; (iv) Repeating a thought to understand it; (v) Considering it each in his own way, ie from his own point of view. By analysing each one of these suggestions carefully step by step to its completion, we found these do not lead to the slowing down of the mind in movement, but to the dulling of the mind. In order to slow down the mind to understand it, the approach is not how to slow it down, but to become aware of its restlessness. We see that, in the very process of following carefully each suggestion or response up to its completion, the mind has already slowed

down.

The approach is therefore much more important than the problem. It must not be through a particular spoke, from a particular point of view, from a combination of a few points of view, or through any particular channel. Through a part, the whole cannot be understood; and organised society and organised religion are only parts. Understanding leads to right action. Being afraid to act, most of us say that, eventually, we shall find Truth. But, we will never see, if we do not see it now. If we do not love now, will we love tomorrow?

## **MADRAS 11TH GROUP DISCUSSION 13TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

Without self-knowledge, order and peace cannot be brought about within oneself and so outside, ie in the world. We considered some of the hindrances to that understanding. When we are up against a hindrance, we immediately think of ways and means to overcome or conquer that hindrance; but overcoming leads us nowhere as we shall have to keep on overcoming or conquering an enemy - politically, economically or religiously, because the hindrance repeats itself. You cannot overcome a hindrance; the hindrance has to be understood by approaching it without condemnation, without judging, without a desire to alter it. Unfortunately, most of us either condemn or pursue it. So long as there is this condemnatory and identifying attitude, the hindrance is not understood.

We saw that the mind has to slow itself down if its restlessness and vagrancy are to be understood. The quietening of the mind was regarded as a problem outside; in following it out, we saw that, in becoming aware of the problem and following each of its responses completely, the mind had become quiet and alert, as the mind had to be quiet to think out each response fully.

Thus, the problem is 'you' and not outside you. It is a trick of the mind to pose the problem as though it was taken from outside. Therefore, the approach is very important. To understand Truth, the mind has first to free itself from the framework of organised society or religion. Most of us agree to this verbally; but, we do not abandon such framework because of the fear that, by freeing ourselves, we are going to create extraordinary disturbances in our



daily life.

Understanding leads to right action and to an urge to speak of that understanding. A truth, probably heard by you, ceases to be a truth when you merely repeat it; it will be a truth to you only when you, for yourself, have discovered it to be true. Propaganda is mere repetition of another's truth; it ceases to be propaganda when you yourself have discovered the truth.

As fear is one of the chief impediments to right action it has to be understood. In trying to understand fear - whether physical or psychological - we shall be making a wrong approach if we discuss fear as a problem outside us.

Physical fear: - Physical body is alert and the instinct of self-preservation makes the body act even without any conscious effort of the person who experiences fear - e.g., nearness to a snake.

Psychological fears: - Fear of losing (i) things, (ii) relationship, i.e., people connected to us and (iii) ideas - i.e., beliefs etc.

At the moment of fear, the person who experiences fear and the quality of fear are one, i.e. a joint phenomenon. Immediately afterwards, there is a separation and you say that you do not like it and that you must do something about it. The moment of fear is unexpected and you meet it unprepared; and at that moment, there is only a state which contains no quality, a state of most heightened sensitivity. As it is physically impossible to continue in that state without collapse or without getting mad, the instinct of self-protection leads to the separation of the thinker and the quality; if pleasant, the thinker identifies himself with it; if unpleasant the thinker condemns the quality and sets about to do something about it. In the case of fear, the thinker wants to get rid of it by

developing courage, going to a temple, or guru, etc, etc, thus developing a whole philosophy; yet, the fear continues to lurk inside all the time. Therefore, the correct approach to the problem is not how to get rid of fear but to realise that there will be fear as long as we are protecting ourselves with property, relationship, name, ideas, beliefs, etc. If we let go any of these, we are nothing; therefore, we are the property, the idea, etc. Thus, frightened of being nothing, we hold on to property, etc, and thereby create a lot of misery in the world. If we tackle our desire for self-protection, then, there will be a transformation, and property etc. will have altogether a different significance.

## **MADRAS 12TH GROUP DISCUSSION 15TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

Life is a continuous challenge and response. Whenever there is a challenge there is a direct response which almost immediately becomes a conditioned response which almost immediately becomes a conditioned response - fear, love, jealousy or something else. At the moment of direct response which is unconditioned, there is only an unprepared state of heightened sensitivity, a state of extreme and intense alertness, without any qualification whatsoever; in that state, there is no dissociation between the person who experiences and the quality which is experienced. As it is extremely difficult to live for any length of time in that state of heightened sensitivity, the conditioned mind which is seeking self-protection, gives it a qualification according to whether pleasure or pain is apprehended; and instantaneously there is a separation of the experiencer from the quality. This leads to a conditioned response.

For instance, when pain is apprehended, the mind gives that state the qualification of fear and, instantaneously, the person who is in a state of fear has separated himself from the quality of fear. Then the person makes a conditioned response to the challenge made by the quality, fear - the conditioned response being "how to overcome fear" or "how to run away from fear." The conditioned mind can never be free of fear by "overcoming it" by compulsion or discipline, because any such overcoming will necessarily repeat itself. Nor can the mind be free by running away from fear. If we examine closely, we shall see how our whole education, culture,

and philosophy are based on running away from conditioned responses like fear. Every attempt to run away from fear fails and the mind is continually engaged in going from one escape to another - only to find ultimately that every such attempt is futile.

When pleasure is apprehended, the experiencer identifies himself with the quality of joy, etc, and goaded by the memory of what he experienced, seeks to have a similar experience again. Another experience of a similar nature only strengthens the memory and therefore strengthens the desire for the experience again. Then, with a view to having absolute security, the conditioned mind projects the idea of God and seeks God. A conditioned mind can only think of the known and not of the unknown. Therefore, the conditioned mind can never find Reality, God.

We are now trying to understand fear. We know how fear distorts and makes the mind small and also poisons the system. The little-minded people are afraid and they cannot understand the supreme. We have seen how futile is the attempt made by the mind either to overcome fear or to run away from fear. We have also seen how fear is primarily based on the mind's desire for self-protection. Naturally, our problem of fear has not been solved so far because we gave importance to and pursued fear which is only a secondary value, instead of giving importance to and pursuing 'the desire for self-protection' which is the primary value. We are in confusion because we give importance to the symptom and not to the cause, to the secondary values and not to the primary.

As fear is a conditioned response, our concern should be not to condemn it or to justify it but to be aware of it as and when it arises

and not run away from it. When we are thus aware of fear and of the process of 'the desire for self-protection', fear ceases and the mind is free of fear.

In understanding fear, one opens the door to the extraordinary meaning of Death which is the Unknown as God is the Unknown. If we do not understand death, we cannot love.

## **MADRAS 13TH GROUP DISCUSSION 18TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

Before we continue the discussion about fear, death and love, we should discuss quite an important subject - the art of listening. Life is really both a challenge and a response, and if we do not know how to respond truly, there will be misery. Similarly, if we do not know how to listen, our mind is so filled with our own thoughts, our own problems, our own conclusions and our own questions, that it is almost impossible to listen to somebody. Is it not possible to listen with an extraordinary alertness, but not with an effort? After all, understanding comes, not through effort but spontaneously when there is an effortless relaxation, a sense of communication with each other. When you love somebody very deeply and really, in that state of real affection, there is a sense of full communication. We do not have to make an effort or to exert ourselves. I think it is important during these discussions to listen with ease but yet with a tension because most of us, when we are at ease, are generally lazy, so relaxed that nothing can penetrate. But, there is a right tension, a psychological tension, not a tension to the breaking point; but, as the string of a violin, it must be tuned just right. Similarly, it is possible for us to listen in such a way that communication is possible instantaneously, at the same time and the same level.

In understanding fear we found that the desire to protect oneself projects the quality of fear, and that merely dealing with the symptom and not with the the cause is utterly futile. So, the question of overcoming fear never arises to a thoughtful person, as

it is only dealing with symptoms and not with the maker of symptoms. A conditioned response is like a wave in a lake when a stone is thrown, and we pursue and try to solve that wave which is a conditioned response. We came to the point of studying what Death means. We said that as reality is unknown, so Death is also unknown. We have spent centuries in studying Reality, but we have hardly spent five minutes in studying Death. We have avoided Death as something abominable, something of which we are frightened and we have tried to overcome it by beliefs and ideations of morality. But we have never understood the significance of Death.

Response and challenge are not different things. They are only separate when the response is conditioned. Our response to a challenge is according to our environmental influence - Brahmin, Non-Brahmin, writer, poet, etc. There is always the distance of time between challenge and response; and when such responses cease, there is death. Let us experiment and be aware of the significance of death on all the different planes of consciousness. We have seen the effects of death on a body, to a bird, to a leaf, wearing out of the physical organism. But that is not death, that is only a part of awareness of death. In life, everything seems to end in death; all our activities, our civilization, wars, conflict with each other, our physical existence, emotional responses, ideation and thoughts, all come to an end. Seeing that all that is known to it comes to an end, the mind apprehends itself coming to an end and, as it does not like to die, seeks permanency by anchoring itself to something unknown which it considers to be secure; if it is not anchored to something which it knows to be secure, it ceases to

function. Thought is the result of the past, the known, the accumulation of what it has read, what it has been told, social environment, religious background, and what it has been conditioned to. As long as the mind is the known, it translates the unknown or any new experience that comes, in the light of the known. When we meet a stranger, we view him with all our prejudices and conditioned responses. In the unknown, there is no security because we do not know it at all. Therefore the mind is afraid of the unknown; therefore it must project itself into the unknown and seek security there. So it must have a belief in the unknown, in Reincarnation, in God, or in an idea, and so on especially as the mind is afraid of coming to an end. Therefore our thoughts are always proceeding from the known to the known, from memory to memory. A memory is the residue, left in the mind, of an experience. The moment the mind is uncertain, it becomes anxious, and therefore it must have the known all the time. If the mind is moving from the known, to the known, it cannot possibly know the unknown; and therefore we are unaware of the significance of Death. We are afraid even to talk about it, and so we put it away and think about God. We deny Death and hold on to God though we do not know what God is. Beauty is not the denial of the ugly. We cannot understand the pleasant by denying the unpleasant. We do not know what the ugly and the unpleasant mean, yet we have condemned them. We do not know what God is, yet we accept God.

Suicide is a part of death. A person who is committing suicide puts an end to his life when he is faced with a problem which he cannot solve, when his thoughts and feelings have come to a point



when they cannot see into the future and cannot proceed further. When one is happy he has no problem and he does not wish to end that.

You ask whether hate is not a manifestation of death. Hate is a conditioned response, Death is also a conditioned response to something which we do not know. Hate does not exist by itself.

Our mind is ever seeking continuance through various means. To us, God is the ultimate continuance and Death the ultimate denial of continuance.

Because thought is the result of the past, it can only think in terms of time, today, yesterday and tomorrow, in terms of the known; and the known it wants to continue. If that continuance is denied, it will commit suicide. It is only concerned with moving from the known to the known. When it proceeds to God, it is only projecting itself into the unknown and seeking security there in God; therefore, that projection, God, is still the known through the mind has invested in God as the ultimate guarantee of its continuance. As long as the mind is moving from the known to the known, it is 'dead', and a 'dead' thing cannot understand anything. When the mind realises that it is 'dead', there will be life. We can discover something amazing when we realise that we are 'dead' and are alive only verbally.

## **MADRAS 14TH GROUP DISCUSSION 20TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

These discussions are a process of self-exploration and self-examination, and not self-introspection which is quite different from awareness. It is as though we are watching a mirror in front of us, which is not distorting our thoughts and our feelings and actions, but is showing exactly 'what is' and not what we would like them to be.

When we discussed about fear we found that fear was only secondary but what was really significant was self-protection in all its extraordinary and subtle ways on different levels and different states of consciousness, which gave rise to fear. In understanding the process of self-protection which is primary, fear which is secondary, loses its significance.

In discussing death, we found that, realising that everything comes to an end - relationship, things and ideas, not only physiological but psychological also - we are afraid of death, we are desirous of proceeding from the known to the unknown, to give us continuity, and this continuity we call immortality. When that continuity comes to an end, we call that death. We do not know Death just as we do not know Reality. We have divided life into living and death and we have shunned death and clung onto what appeared to give us security. I think it is important that we should understand the whole question of death because, in that, there is renewal. That which ends has always a beginning. That which continues without an end has no renewal.

As thought moves from the known to the unknown, there is no

ending of thought; therefore, there is no renewal; and it is only in death there is renewal. A society can be renewed only when it throws off the old. But you cannot have the old and the new together and that leads to destruction. It is one of the tricks of the mind that, being confronted with uncertainty, it seeks security elsewhere in property, family, ideas and beliefs and so on. As one cannot think of the unknown, one can only think of the known, the outcome of the thought which is the result of the past. Thought abominates coming to an end, that is, to be uncertain of anything, and it wants continuance.

Ordinarily, in the physical sense, we desire to continue through property, through our job and through our routine. Psychologically, we continue through our memory. All our systems are based on continuity. We seek continuity in property, name, and identifying ourselves with something. When we find that there is no continuity or permanency in objects we turn to psychological factors, such as beliefs and ideas and so on. The thought, being afraid of discontinuity, thinks in terms of the continuity of the soul. Continuity implied through a belief or through the soul is the product of thought and therefore it is the result of the known, because thought can only think of something which it knows. So thought is really concerned with continuity and not with Truth or God. Continuity is a time-process and there cannot be a renewal in the time-process.

Memory is the residue left in the mind of insufficient experience; and when an experience is complete there is no memory.

Some say that the mind is the instrument of the spirit. But the

spirit is also the process of the mind. The moment we say there is spirit, it is a process of thought. There is perception, sensation, contact, desire and identification, all processes of challenge and response. In other words, we have exercised thought which is the product of the mind. Even while we are sleeping, the unconscious is working, which gives hints to thoughts. When we are thinking about something beyond, it is also the process of the mind and therefore it is unreal.

To say that God is 'me' is incorrect as God or Truth cannot exist in contradiction, because we are in ourselves having the evil and the good, which is a contradictory state. Complete paralysis is death and incomplete paralysis is life. We come across several people who are both physiologically and psychologically half dead, yet they function. If God is in us, we need not purify ourselves or renew ourselves.

Every experience is leaving a residue and we call it memory. When we meet an experience anew, it will not leave any residue; that occurs when we meet the experience direct without a screen. When new wine is put in the old bottle it breaks. When we are thinking about death, we are not looking at facts, but are translating it to suit our conditioning. Because we are not looking direct at facts but through a screen or a condition or a belief, we are not finding the truth of it. When we do that, we are only strengthening our conditioning and the walls of our conditioning are growing thicker and thicker. As memory is of the known, when we are facing the unknown, we withdraw and translate it in terms of the known. We think we can thereby have continuance. We cannot understand either Death or Reality through memory. There is no

renewal through continuance. Because we are caught up in the walls of memory, whether the memory is of the leftist or the rightist, religious or the non-religious, we are dead. Only when the walls break there is going to be renewal. A society that is merely transforming itself within the walls, cannot produce culture. In order to bring about a renewal we must die; and that means we must start anew, putting away completely all memories of the past.

## **MADRAS 15TH GROUP DISCUSSION 22ND NOVEMBER, 1947**

We have been discussing the question of death and fear and we said that any form of continuity is death because continuity implies a constant movement of thought in the fortress of the known.

Thought is always moving from the known to the known, from memory to memory, from continuity to continuity, and it cannot think of the unknown. It can verbally picture the unknown or speculate on it, but that picture is not the unknown.

Because the mind is moving in the field of the known, it gives continuity to it through the family, through property, through responsibility, through the machine of routine, through ideation and through belief.

Memory is merely the residue of experience. We experience through the screen of the past and therefore there is no experience at all but only a modification of experience. If we have a certain belief, that belief not only creates that experience, but also translates that experience according to its conditioning. So there is never an experience which is free from conditioning.

When the continuity through the family, through the name, through relationship, etc. is threatened, there is fear; and the ultimate threat to continuity is death. There is no renewal or rebirth in that state; a renewal can only be effected in ending.

Meditation is thought freeing itself from continuity and then there is renewal, creation and reality. Our whole structure of thinking is based on the desire for continuity. In understanding continuity we can understand the significance of rebirth or renewal.

Our process of thought is based on time - yesterday, today and tomorrow. Yesterday coming in contact with today creates the present. Yesterday's memory continuing today in a modified or transformed manner is the present. The present thought has its root in the past and so thought is continuity. The thinking process of a process of time and therefore a process of memory. Since we do not understand the process of our thinking, which is the result of time, merely to deny continuity is completely useless. If we want to understand the truth of continuity, we must watch it, go with it, every moment of the day. We are not concerned with physical continuity. What we are primarily concerned about is whether through things there is psychological continuity; that is, we are not concerned with the continuity of matter, but are concerned with the value we give to matter. We have seen that one of the causes of the havoc and destruction in this world is our extraordinary adherence to property.

We need a certain amount of food, clothing and shelter. But, the moment we bring psychological value into it, it creates chaos. The moment we use our position or property as a means of psychological continuity, there is chaos.

When we feel pain we take immediate action to arrest it. We do not seem to take such psychological action with regard to property, which means we are not aware of what we are doing.

Our desire for continuity has brought us to death; it has made us insensitive and inactive. Psychologically we have given ourselves over to property and so we are dead, because things are dead. So, we have discovered the truth that the moment we have continuity through property, we are dead.

The same is the case with regard to relationship. When we seek continuity through the family, we give importance to continuity and not to the family, and thus we are creating the nation, the group, etc, which leads to disaster, or to death.

Similarly, ideas are also a form of continuity. We believe that we live even after our death. It is a belief through which we find continuity in some other quarter and at a different level. We cling to our God, our Truth, our Path and so on. So, the different kinds of organised beliefs have led us to division between ourselves, the Hindu, the Christian, and the Muslim and so on. There is only unity through intelligence and love. It is only when we recognise we are dead that there can be life. If we recognise we are blind, we would be careful and would not make any dogmatic assertion about anything.

What happens if one of your nearest relatives passes away? It is a great shock and a paralysis to the mind because you have invested your affection in him and he has come to an end, and suddenly you find that there is a psychological and physical breakage. You suddenly realise that you are alone. As you do not like the loneliness, there is sorrow, not exactly because your relative is dead, but because you have discovered your loneliness which you do not like.

That is, as you do not like what you are, you seek continuity through property, relationship and ideas - which has led you to utter chaos and misery. We cannot proceed any further without the recognition of that.

If we recognise that we are dead, there will be a revolution in our daily life. There will no longer be the psychological attachment



to name, to family and to position. There will be a revolution with regard to our beliefs, which implies the cessation of beliefs.

We have seen and heard about several revolutions which have all brought about misery. But a revolution which is completely different from the revolution of theory, is a revolution of values, a revolution of thought, which can only come about by the recognition of 'what is'. There is a revolution in thought when I know I am blind. My whole action will be different; Then I will be very tentative, very watchful; I do not accept, but listen, I move very slowly, my whole being is revolutionised. If I do not recognise that I am blind, my actions will be quite different. If we refuse to recognise what is, we cannot find what truth is, because truth may be in that which is and not away from it.

## **MADRAS 16TH GROUP DISCUSSION 25TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

Before we proceed with our discussion about continuity and death, I think we ought to consider for a few minutes the art of listening. In order to understand, you should listen without any apprehension, without any fear of loss or fear of pain. Because you are suffocated with so many erroneous ideas and beliefs, there is no immediate communication with one another. Communication is possible not when there is fear but only when there is love.

We ought to consider very deeply the attitude of teaching and learning. Is there such a thing as teaching and learning? Do you learn anything? You may learn a technique, how to play the piano, or construct a motor, or how to drive. Our whole attitude towards life is the question of something we are going to learn, or something we are teaching. Communion with each other stops when there is this attitude of learning or teaching. There is beauty in real communion, which can only come with love. When there is, on the part of one, the attitude of learning, and, on the part of the other, the attitude of teaching, communion really ceases; and without communion, without partaking, without sharing, and without being together in good company, clear thinking is almost impossible.

During these few weeks of discussion have you learned anything? If you caught a few phrases or a few sentences from me, that is not learning. I was not teaching, but we were travelling together in deep communion, and therefore there was an understanding simultaneously, at the same time and at the same

place.

A man who is merely teaching is not living any more than a man who is merely listening. If we can alter fundamentally that attitude of learning and teaching, we can enter into communion with each other. It is a mistake to go to somebody to learn. If you are enthusiastic and eager, then you will be able to share the wisdom, the song, or the truth with another. When a child is learning music, the teacher instructs him how to put his fingers and so on. But if he is really interested, he would be pestering the teacher with so many questions about music; then the relationship between the teacher and the pupil is immediately changed.

We are used to being told or being directed; as such, I become the teacher, and you become the learner, which is really absurd. After all we all human beings, not divided into the teacher and the pupil and all the other absurdities.

We are here to find out what is reality, what is love, and not for me to tell you, and for you to follow. Now, if we can establish proper relationship, there would be a real affection and therefore a quick response.

In discussing continuity, we have found out that we seek continuity through name, property, etc. and that genetic continuance and physiological continuance have become extraordinarily important, as long as psychological continuance is maintained. This psychological continuance is doing great havoc in this world, as can be seen from history and from what is happening nowadays.

Certain political systems have limited physical continuity. for instance, the father can no longer leave as before property for his

son to inherit. But there is the emotional continuity, the ideological continuity which ultimately beings about agony and misery.

Continuity is memory. All our life is a challenge and a response. There is the response to a condition and that condition is modified or altered according to circumstances, but it is always conditioned; and any experience which comes along is met through a screen of conditioned response. The conditioned response is memory. We experience and we translate our experience according to our belief. Therefore, that experience is not fully completed. It is always broken down to constitute a particular condition and therefore, there is never a complete action.

So, we, from day to day, carry yesterday to today and today to tomorrow and there is always the conditional burden of memory, not factual memory but psychological memory. The older we are, the heavier it becomes. This continuity is really decay, and the older we are the more we are decayed, the more mentally sterile we are. I do not know if you have noticed that an experience that is followed through completely, leaves no residue.

Accumulated memory is static. It has no life unless we inject new life into it, ie, by our recalling the memory, we revive it. By this static memory which is dead we translate life which is a living thing.

We believe in God, not knowing what God is. We cannot have an idea of something which we do not know. We know Him by reading books written by somebody else. Reality can never be described. A man who loves, may tell us what love is; but can we know love in that way? We can imagine about it. In the very telling of what God or Love is, we have put that into a small vessel, in our

own vessels; and it is not Truth. The very description of Reality by a person who has experienced Reality, is a denial of truth. If we put Reality into words, it ceases to be the Real. We think about God as a form of security, as a form of gratification or comfort. In other words, we are not really seeking God, but comfort through God. We seek happiness through things, property, relationship, etc. and, therefore, they become important. We do not know God and if we say that we are living in God, it is a form of traditional assertion.

Viewing it realistically, we can see that we love our family because it gives us joy; we love that which gives us pleasure, that which brings us a reward. As long as we are mutually agreeable, we love each other. It means that if we eliminate this pleasure or pain, there is nothing left, and so there is no love. We only know pleasure and pain and we do not know what love is. Therefore, to understand what love is, we must be free from pleasure and pain.

We do not know what God is, what Death is, and what Love is. These are the three amazing principles in life, of which we do not know, though we talk about them. So, the wise man says that he would not talk of them any more.

How can we find out what Love is? There are certain extraordinary moments in our life when we do love, i.e. when there is no pleasure or pain, when there is no relationship in love. These are very rare and extraordinarily beautiful moments.

Anything built on memory has no value; and as most of our relationship is built on memory, it has no significance. Therefore, how can our minds which are caught in the net of pain and pleasure be freed? Any action, inside the net, to get out of it, is still based on pleasure and pain. We have woven a net and brought everything

into it. What is our response to this fact? We are looking at it through a screen and therefore we are not directly faced with it. The moment we face and recognise the fact without a screen, there is Truth. Since we are unwilling to face the fact we are hypocrites. So to get out of the net, we have, first of all, to be aware of the fact that we are hypocrites. The implications of this are tremendous. Love and hypocrisy can never go together. The very recognition of the fact that we are hypocrites or exploiters will bring about an instantaneous change in our actions.

## **MADRAS 17TH GROUP DISCUSSION 27TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

We have met in this group not for learning as in a classroom but to discuss with each other; and, in exchanging our thoughts, we begin to discover our own process of thinking. This is a self-revealing process, not of some metaphysical higher or superior self, but of the self which is working through you and me. Without self-knowledge which is being aware of our own actions and our own feelings, there can be no right thinking at all.

Self-knowledge as distinct from factual knowledge or the knowledge of a technique, is not a matter of learning from another; it can come about only through awareness. No understanding or comprehension can come when our relationship is that of the teacher and the taught, a Master and a Disciple, or a Guru and a 'Sishya'. Learning is not understanding; it is really destructive, whereas understanding is creative. Understanding comes only through communion, which is possible only when there is deep love.

These discussions are meant to establish that extraordinary depth of understanding in which right relationship with another can be established.

We have discussed various subjects, the various hindrances to clarity of thought, also other things like "fear", "death" and "love".

Our whole social, economic and psychological structure is based on the desire for profit and gain, on pleasure and pain; that which is pleasurable we accept and that which is not pleasurable we reject.

Our relationship has also a similar basis. I like you as long as you like me; and if you do not like me, I find someone else. Our so-called friendship is really mutual gratification. Our emotional structure is based on this.

You love Reality as long as it is pleasurable or profitable to you; when it is painful, you reject it and go to a guru or somebody else; and thus you go on seeking gratification.

As long as the mind is seeking pleasure and avoiding pain, there cannot be love. We misuse the word love when we call this love. We do not really know what love means.

Since we do not know what it is to think rightly, deeply and profoundly, our solutions, political or religious, are in no way going to produce a sane and balanced world. After all, the world is you and I; and it is no good trying to love each other when we do not know how to love.

It is no good discussing theoretically what love is. We can only start with what we know, i.e., by examining and becoming aware of "what is." What we call love is really based on the desire to please and to avoid pain. Actually, all our relationship is based on pleasure and gratification. Our desire for gratification pulls us along and pushes us also along into a mass of beliefs. From that relationship, we talk of having a duty, a responsibility, etc, which are all words having no significance, because they are merely based on gratification.

Some of you say that love gives you a sense of unity with another. Do you feel unity with the object you do not like? Obviously not. We give ourselves over to beauty and deny ugliness. That is, by the denial of vice, we become virtuous. We



deny the non-pleasurable and hold on to the pleasurable. This self-immolation is an identification with what we call the beautiful, that which is intensely gratifying. We call that devotional love. Has that love any perfume or is it merely gratification?

You would not seek God if you do not want security, an ultimate permanency. In yourself you are insecure, the world around you is catastrophic, and you want an assurance of continuity; and, therefore, you want to identify yourself with what you call God. Therefore, you are not seeking God but only gratification. Gratification through God is just like gratification through drink though the one is a refined ideation, and the other a gross desire.

Similar is the man who identifies himself with an ideal like beauty and pursues it. As any ideal is only a creation of the mind, that too is impermanent, and that exists only as long as you find gratification in it and accept it. Thus, due to our inward poverty, we seek only gratification through things, relationship, and ideation such as God, ideal, etc; we do not seek God or an ideal as we drop them the moment we do not find pleasure in them.

There are however certain rare moments when the state of non-relationship exists in contra-distinction to relationship which exists only on the basis of pleasure and pain. But in that sense of complete self-immolation, there is no asking; in that state of non-relationship with another, when you love somebody, there is that quality of non-demand. At those moments, you are left silent; later on, further reactions come. It happens to someone, one in a million, and he is a happy man. Once he knows what it is, it is like a scent that is perfuming his whole life.

Why are we not awake to such moments much more often? Why do we not realise that our pursuit of drunkenness, God or an ideal is only the pursuit of our escape from facing the actual, and therefore reduces us to a state of dullness and insensitivity? It is because of various hindrances like conclusions, beliefs, trying to avoid death, worship of God and non-existence of affection. By being aware of these hindrances, they can be dissolved.

Is memory, psychological and not factual, a hindrance to understanding? Let us think this out. What is memory? Let us begin with ourselves and enquire into it without involving ourselves in explanations. Going back and looking into the past pleasures and pains, or going to the future with its hopes and ambitions, are forms of memory.

Why does the mind go backwards and forwards like this? In our attempt to understand the problem of memory, we have now found that mind which is itself a result of the past and is the current of the past, the present and the future, has separated itself in the present from the current, as though it is a separate entity; it looks on itself as the thinker, the feeler, the perceiver, goes back to the past and says "I remember". It also conceives of the future, thus giving rise to three entities - the thinker, the past, and the future - as though they are different from one another.

The problem now is "Can the mind separate itself from the past?" The thinker cannot go back to the past unless he is the product of the past; therefore, he and the past are one and not separate. So, when I say "I remember", I am making a false statement. Memory is ever continuing from the past, in the present, and into the future. The past includes my parents, my forefathers

and also mankind with all their accumulations, traditions, superstitions, fears and conditions - social, economic, racial, religious, etc. Thus when we enquire what memory is, we should know who the enquirer is. The enquirer is the mind which has separated itself from itself which is the past; and this division is a false action, because any product of the mind must, like the mind itself, be also a product of the past. The observer and the observed are the same; therefore, the observer is making a false statement when it says "I am looking at the stream and going back to the past". We now see the absurdity of the whole process - the observer, though the same as the observed, imagines himself to be separate from, and superior to it, and attempts to examine the observed through memory; finally, he realises that he is not separate from the observed and the separation was false.

In seeing the false as false, Truth is perceived.

## **MADRAS 18TH GROUP DISCUSSION 29TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

The desire to listen and the action of listening are two quite different states. Most of us are concerned with the desire to learn, to teach, or to acquire something; and in this, effort is involved. If you are interested in what is said, you listen without any effort, and there is communion. So let us listen as though we are really enjoying it, not merely putting up a resistance, or trying to contradict or trying to put your own ideas quicker than somebody else can.

We are dealing with memory, an extraordinary and subtle subject. The majority of us have not thought about this; therefore it requires an extraordinarily attentive mind to follow the current, the movement, the swiftness of it, because each of us is projecting his interpretation of what he considers memory to be. We have to understand the function of memory, either as a means to action, or as a means to understanding. I would suggest that you listen carefully and quietly rather than try to listen or concentrate on listening.

To me authority is binding and blinding. Where there is authority, you do not listen in the same manner as to someone who is talking with you in a friendly manner, and there is little communication. Therefore, do not look on me as an authority, but listen with affectionate and thoughtful attention. We saw that memory is continuity., The self, i.e., the 'I' or the 'me' is a bundle of memories or of qualities or tendencies accumulated through memory, the residual experience of the mind which is the desire,

which is the 'me' moving in this continuity. This stream of continuity which we call memory, is a time-process, the time-process being the past, the present and the future.

The mind shuttles back and forward in this continuity, and it is not aware that it is still a part of the continuity, when it separates itself from the stream of continuity, and says 'I remember', 'I recollect', 'I hope', which is future action. When the mind says 'I remember', it considers itself to be separate from "continuity" and looks to the past or to the future, which are the same as 'continuity'. We have to understand why the mind, which is the thinker, the observer, the experiencer, the same as the current of continuity, has separated itself from this constant stream of continuity. The mind is not merely the superficial layer of consciousness but also the unconscious with its many, many layers which is all 'memory'. The understanding of 'memory' is directly related to the understanding of 'Love', "Death", 'Reality'.

Why does the mind separate itself from the stream of continuity and say 'I remember'? The 'I' is non-existent if its qualities are removed. The 'I' is non-existent without memory, its tendencies, gifts and so on, i.e. non-existent without continuity, the racial, the traditional, the past in conjunction with the now, the past flowing through the present to the future which is hope. If we cannot understand that, we cannot bring about a regeneration, a renewal, an ending.

We discussed that what is continuous, the physiological as well as the psychological continuity, is binding, and that there is renewal only in death and not in continuity. There can be death as a renewal only when the whole consciousness is completely empty.

For this to happen, every action that you meet should leave no residue, and you should meet anew every experience as it comes.

The whole of our existence is a form of continuity and our whole tendencies are to generate one habit or another. The routine is a habit and habit is a form of continuity. Therefore, we have to discuss the action of memory on all our activities. Technique is learning so as to be able to act in a particular manner without conscious effort. For instance, when you learn the violin, you learn the technique and the words of the song; but you do not learn the joy in the song, i.e. in learning how to play, you do not learn music. Similarly, when I am learning engineering, I am learning facts. to be a creative engineer is different from the technique of engineering. Do you write a poem because you know the technique of writing it? We know factual memory, i.e. dealing with facts, talents, expression of talents and so on. We translate them psychologically to suit ourselves whenever we make a response to any challenge we meet.

It is a fact that our society has recognised caste divisions and has viewed its citizens as belonging to a particular category and that your responses are therefore trained to the category to which you belong. Your whole attitude towards life is based on the division that you are this label. Though you are a human being like the rest, you function or respond only according to that label. You are thus conditioned by tradition to a series of memories that have been handed down by tradition.

What is implied in thinking a thought through? Here is a thought that we are aware of, that we have only factual memory of and nothing else. When I understand that as a false statement with

all its implications, I am free from that false statement and therefore I see the truth.

The factual is the screen, is the 'me' in action with the residual, the unconscious 'me', which is hidden; therefore, there is always a conflict between the hidden and the factual. We are aware of the factual, the factual being the immediate, whether the immediate is two to three days, or two to three years.

The conscious mind which is of the superficial layers of consciousness, is aware of the factual, because it is the product of facts learned at school or taught, the immediate response or immediate knowledge through books, through assertion, through techniques and so on. That is, the superficial layers of consciousness are factual memories. Through these layers everything is being translated and accumulated. That accumulation and the unconscious, the hidden as well as the superficial layers, are the whole of 'me'. The hidden layers are all residues of all humanity, as you are not one isolate human entity but the result of the whole of humanity. You are only conscious in the superficial layers, i.e., only, factually; and these conscious layers are always translating and therefore misrepresenting, misinterpreting experiences that are being met, and are strengthening the unconscious by adding to it more and more.

As long as I have the screen of facts through which I translate every experience, the residue is falling below. If I have no screen then it will be quite different.

The problem is that I am only aware of factual memories and I am not aware of psychological memories. I am aware of facts, techniques and actions as memory. I have learned how to play and

I translate every song through my technique. I have learned how to write and I am translating the untranslatable. Therefore, as long as I have a technique, the vision of a poem is always limited. As long as I have a technique, which is factual memory, I cannot find that which has no technique.

As long as my brain is made up of facts, techniques, discipline, everyday routine, it cannot find the immeasurable. After all when I write a poem, it is to think of the immeasurable. After writing it I think I am dissatisfied with it because I feel I have not captured the spirit; and in that very process I get lost; thus the process becomes much more important than the problem.

With this mentality of the awareness of the factual, i.e., through the screen of the conscious, we are trying to understand that which is not factual, that which we call Love, God, Death, the Unknown.

Consciousness comes into being when there is friction, when I meet a response, when there is disharmony. Consciousness begins when there is interruption. When I am awake and look at the trees there is no friction, there is no response. I am only watching the tree.

The pursuit of pleasure and avoidance of pain is consciousness. I am conscious when I want or do not want something. Previous to want and non-want, am I conscious? Are you conscious when there is no want and do you know that state? When I wake up, somebody comes and smiles and I like it. It is friction. The fact is that I become conscious when there is struggle, either pleasurable or painful.

There may be various degree of consciousness, friction, pleasurable or painful, and all the subtle variations of that friction.



All that makes me conscious and from that I say existence is pleasurable or painful.

As long as there is effort there is self-consciousness, and yet you say I must make effort to free myself from greed. If effort is self-consciousness, then our whole process is effort; and therefore, we are merely strengthening the consciousness of the self. We are building walls and walls and how can such a consciousness free itself from effort?

What is memory? Why has the mind separated itself from the current of time? How do I set about trying to find the truth myself? I must study the problem. I must not take sides about the problem. I must free myself from all prejudices. I must not be biased, for or against the problem. That means I must free thought from my bias about the problem, and I must come to it anew.

If memory is static or dynamic, the result must also be static or dynamic as the case may be. Memory by itself is static; it is dead, and is given life when I recollect it either as pain or pleasure. Who is the entity that recalls it? That entity is the result of memory. This has to be pursued and understood.

## **MADRAS 19TH GROUP DISCUSSION 2ND DECEMBER, 1947**

It seems to me that, without self-knowledge, there will be no right thinking. I mean by self-knowledge, not the mysterious, the hidden, the super-self, the higher self, the Atman or anything of that kind; I mean the self that thinks, feels and acts now, here, in our everyday existence. Without understanding the thoughts, the feelings, the actions that we go through every day almost automatically, without seeing their deep significance, there can be no right thinking. That is the self-knowledge I am talking about.

You must begin very near to go very far. It is no good beginning very far for coming near. Paramatman, the super-atman and all the rest of it are mere assumption based on belief and therefore utterly valueless to a really thoughtful man. In discovering the process of our own thinking we shall find out - not through an authority, not through books, but for each one of us - whether there is such a thing as Reality or not. This idea that there is a super-self, is still part of thought and is therefore conditioned; therefore, the super-self cannot be superior to mind.

Wisdom is not found in books, nor in repetition, nor in rituals. Wisdom is found through right thinking and right thinking cannot possibly exist without self-knowledge.

I wish to talk to you today about "belief", a thing which is very near and in which most of us are caught. You may say that we have gone over that subject ten different times.

Mind is constantly wrapping itself in belief, belief in ideation, belief in memory, etc. Essentially we believe in order to be secure,

not to get lost in the wood, to have a lighthouse, to have a point towards which thought is culminating, progressing, focussing. This focal point helps us to guide ourselves. A belief, whether physiological or psychological, is a necessity to him who is frightened. 'It is my experience and therefore I hold on to it as a guide, a conviction which helps me to progress in life.' Surely belief, a conclusion, a working hypothesis, a conviction, an experience which I hold on to as a guide, an ideal, a conviction which helps me to progress in life, are all merely a pattern, a mould in which the thought functions.

The ideal, the belief, is in the future, something projected or accepted by you as a pattern for you to be modified; and therefore it is in the net of time and therefore that does not lead you to the eternal, to happiness. The end is of the same nature as the means; if you use wrong means, you create wrong ends.

Are we aware of the fact that we have belief? Beauty is considered to be an ideal, a distant thing. The man who does not see the beauty around him keeps the ideal of beauty, and he has no beauty in him. There is beauty now, in the face that smiles, in the stars, in the leaves, and so on. Because we do not see that beauty, we have recourse to the ideal of beauty. Some of you say that life would be impossible if we do not believe - for example, in the existence of London. But several things are involved in this. That is the question of verification. You can ask ten different people and they will tell you where London is; you can also go and see. That is verification. But you all believe in reincarnation or in something else of that kind, which is incapable of verification.

A million people tell me that they believe there is God or there

is a Master. Does their belief prove to me that there is God? Any belief that I hold, projects itself as an experience; and then I say it is true because I have experienced it. I believe in reincarnation because it gives me a future chance, a psychological hope; I project that hope, and experience it as an actual experience. How often you have heard people say "I know it, it has happened" as though there is no more to be said! You can only verify when you do not believe.

I do not care whether the Master exists or does not exist, because I want to find out whether he is important in life. I find out that he is not important, and therefore I am not concerned whether he exists or not.

Physical verification is one thing, and psychological verification is quite another thing. Millions of people can be made, by modern propaganda, to believe in anything - as it has been proved over and over again - in war, in nationalism, in butchery, in calling themselves Mohammedans or Hindus and killing each other.

You believe in reincarnation. But it does not affect your life at all. If it has affected your life a single second, your attitude would have been quite different. So belief has no importance whatsoever, it is just a marvellous escape. Similarly, our belief in God is merely a matter of convenience to you; it does not make any vital difference in your life.

Some one among you said that he believed in Communism because he saw its good effect. This means that you believe in what produces a good effect and you do not believe in what produces a bad effect. If you are concerned with the effect only, you believe even if a good result is produced through a bad means.

For instance, you believe that by butchering and by creating misery now, you will produce peace and plenty in the future. You believe in things that are gratifying. Whether it is true or false, as long as it satisfies you, you believe in that. There is positive gratification and negative gratification. If I do not achieve gratification positively, I say 'no' and that denial also gives me pleasure. You are doing ceremonies because it gratifies you. When you say it is helping others who are dead and gone, you are bringing in a different problem; which means you are doing it on authority because you books say so, your grandfather did so, or your religion says so.

Your beliefs divide you into antagonistic groups. Beliefs induce mere habits which make you dull and which make you do things without knowing why you do them.

## **MADRAS 20TH GROUP DISCUSSION 4TH DECEMBER, 1947**

We do not want to be uncertain, to be in a state of confusion. So, we use belief as the most gratifying means to guide ourselves. We are not discussing belief in an isolated manner, but as related to self-knowledge, the self which is in action every day - our feelings, our thoughts and actions from moment to moment - and to think out and understand the significance of every thought, every feeling as it arises, thus uncovering the process of our own thinking so that we perceive the state of our own mind, our own being.

Without understanding the creator of the self, the 'me', there can be no right action; and to bring about right thinking we must examine every thought fully and completely.

We shall take one subject, like belief, at a time and think it right through so that, at the end of it, those of you who are really earnest will be free of belief, because you will perceive the truth of belief. You cannot find the truth if you are on the defensive, if you are guarding yourself.

In belief is implied authority, an authority either imposed by a society, by a tradition, or the authority through experience in oneself, the authority of memory. You have an experience and you have learned something; and you use what you have learned to translate, interpret, further experience. Therefore, that experience which you have added becomes your authority, which you call the 'voice'. But, essentially it is an experience which has left a residue of memory which has been used for translating further experiences.

Belief also implies specialisation, i.e., if you have an ideal, an

end, you specialise to achieve that. What happens to specialists? They are fixed either in knowledge, surgery or money making, etc. They are static and frozen. The man who specialises is immobile. He moves within the frame-work of his specialisation which is always fixed. A thing which is fixed is unpliant and therefore it is broken. All specialised animals are becoming extinct.

A man who is very firmly fixed in a belief is not pliant; and only that which is pliant, is enduring. I am not speaking of the pliability of a Hindu going to Europe and learning to smoke and learning to drink. That is stupidity. Pliability implies a freedom from anchorages, from specialisation, from authority and so on.

Mostly, the actions based on belief, like ceremonies and rituals, are done by you without knowing why you do them. Therefore belief is binding and blinding and there is repetition of such acts without much significance.

You want to know the difference between a conclusion and a conviction. A conclusion is that which is based on knowledge or that which is inherited from one's parents, from teachers, from society and through environmental influences or those which one has made. After all, conclusions which one makes are the results of the past which is the conditioning of the environment and the tradition. A conviction is also based on the past. A man who has no past cannot have convictions. A man who is without memories cannot live in convictions. The more convictions you have the more enclosed you are. Therefore, conclusions and convictions are more or less the same and they are all conditioned. You cannot be free of them unless you recognise them as enclosures.

You say you have given up ceremonies now. Why did you give

up? Did you give up ceremonies through understanding or through substitution? If you understand the true significance of ceremonies, they will fall off of their own accord. Otherwise, you will be merely substituting for them something else to which you will become a slave. Most of you do ceremonies automatically, because your fathers and mothers have told you; it becomes a thoughtless action and, when you have children, they are also going to do so in the same way. If you have not belief in them but do them merely to please somebody, you are really indulging in a hypocritical action.

You say that you do not do the ceremonies but feed the poor on those days. Why are you feeding the poor? If you feed the poor because you love the poor irrespective of their class and caste, and not for capitalistic or communistic reasons, it is something.

Someone said that as you want to live peacefully without creating any disturbance, you do the ceremonies; but life will not give you peace and it constantly challenges you.

When you do not like any particular ceremony, you seek a substitution and do it; thus, you have given up ceremonies and taken to "poor-feeding." I am not concerned with the giving up of ceremonies; but I want to know why I do the ceremonies.

I heard someone of you say that you do the ceremonies because of an urge from within. We know the biological urges, hunger, sex, etc., and we can trace them to their cause. But, psychological urges are much more difficult to trace, e.g. the urge to be angry, the drive of ambition to become somebody, the desire for power, position, prestige, money, a bigger house, etc. If you have an urge, it is necessary to find out why you have it and not to indulge in it blindly. The unconscious and hidden urges and thoughts are



understandable if we give our mind to them, i.e. if the superficial consciousness is free and therefore in a state fit to understand them. If the urge on which you act, is a sane and balanced urge, it will tell you not to be greedy; but you do not follow that. You act only when the urge is pleasurable and not otherwise. That is why in this so-called spiritual country, the Brahmins who were once the highest expression of culture, have become degraded into shopkeepers and lawyers.

We must understand the implications of obeying, and what it means to overcome or to sublimate something. Physically, when uncertain, you obey a sign-board based on a physical fact. Psychologically you obey another because you are afraid. You command or obey when there is anxiety, a sense of uncertainty. If you love there is no question of obeying or commanding; you simply love each other. If I want to get something from you, physiologically or psychologically, I am dominated by you and therefore there is no love. So, you obey an authority either through fear or through a desire for a result based on your gratification.

You obey a tradition or what society says only when it suits you, when it is gratifying to you; because if you do not, you will be in anxiety. Through obedience, you think you will sublimate yourself. That is what all the religions have said 'Obey the Guru, obey the idea and you will sublimate'. You have done this for centuries, and you are none the better. To sublimate something you must understand it; the moment you understand something you are free of it.

You say that by prayer and by performing ceremonies, you can get God to intervene in your personal affairs. God is something

extraordinary and immeasurable; and it is fantastic to say that He speaks through somebody or is interested in any particular person. People accept that He speaks through Churchill for England, and through Hitler for Germany. We reverence such people instead of saying how ridiculous and how infantile they are. If God or a Master is really interested in me, He will tell me the whole thing and not little by little; He will also tell me to give up greed, not to hate, not to cheat and so on, which are much more important than ridiculous ceremonies or the renunciation of the world. An intelligent teacher or an intelligent doctor will surely ask you to get rid of the cause, instead of merely tinkering with a few symptoms. It may be that what you call your inner voice is merely yourself talking in the guise of a voice.

You say that you perform rituals because your deeper self says so. Why do you accept what the deeper layer of the mind says, without investigating it? That voice or command may be false. Whenever you obey commands of 'deeper self' or God, you obey only in the most stupid things and not in the greatest things. You do not love your neighbour. If you really love your neighbour, there will be kindness, mercy to the animals, to the fatherless, there will not be any harsh words about anybody. You are obeying only that which is extraordinarily gratifying, like ceremonies. Therefore you do not really obey, but you are merely gratifying yourself. If you love your daughter and do not consider her as a thing to be 'married off', there will be much difference. You will not then be concerned in only one question, i.e., her marriage, but in bringing her up. You will tell her about life, you would take care of her, teach her what life is, educate her about the rotten state of society

around you and so on. All this is difficult, so you consider it your duty to marry her off anyhow as long as her misery is away from you. In other words, you are not really concerned with your daughter but only with yourself.

You have not realised that nothing valuable can be had without trouble. Even the most tender plant has to struggle. You just have babies and let them grow anyhow. You do not know them.

Most of you do not know your most intimate relatives with whom you live. You do not know yourself. That is why you have neglected your babies, your children and your youth. You do not know how the Americans love their children and what trouble they take in regard to the care of children. If you love your children, you will be extremely watchful what they do, and what they think; you would question them why they do certain things, their notions, their actions, so that they become self-critical and observant; you would see what they eat, watch them go to bed, and be careful so that they have confidence in you; you will also discuss how to teach children and how to be brotherly. But, you do not do all this.

If you merely abide by the tradition of society you do not know what you think. Merely following the current of society is superstition. If you want to understand the current you must detach yourself from the current. Perhaps our whole existence is thoughtless. This may be the result of the thoughtless past, which is the product of the group and therefore you must begin with the nearest thing that is yourself. Whether you affect the many or not, you are not concerned; because if you understand something, that itself is sufficient.

## **MADRAS 21ST GROUP DISCUSSION 6TH DECEMBER, 1947**

We have been discussing belief in relation to self-knowledge which is not understanding or the awareness of something higher, but being aware of every thought, feeling and action. To climb high, one has to go through the valley, through the turmoils, through the everyday thoughts and struggles and understand them. We are really reluctant to understand what is in the valley, the valley being our everyday existence.

How can we go far unless we understand what is near, the near being our relationship with ourselves and our neighbour, with family, etc. That relationship is an extraordinary self-revealing process. Because we do not want to go through that, we are escaping through belief, through ceremonies, and all other absurd and infantile things, giving them fanciful names without much significance.

It is very important to free the mind where it is, in your daily life, and to be aware of the words you use, the gestures, the attitudes, the motives, and the intentions. After all, what does it matter whether you believe in a Master or not, or what kind of ceremonies you perform? What does matter is what you are thinking, what you are doing.

A man who came to see me, wanted peace of mind. When I asked him what he was doing in his daily life, he said "That does not matter, I am only speculating". He is a speculator, dealing in money, bullion. How can such a man have peace of mind and how can he have God when he is hoarding, cheating, making people

miserable by his actions? If at all he thinks he has peace, that will only be a deception, a self-deceit. To have peace, he must not speculate, he must not destroy others.

Similarly, those who wish to find Truth must free themselves from all bondages.

A man who believes is extraordinarily credulous, and therefore he is obstinate and therefore unpliant. A tree that weathers the storm, through it has deep roots, is pliant; but a tree which is still and not pliant, is broken down. In the same way, a man who is not pliant, who is credulous, who is obstinate, is broken down, and he is miserable. The central problem will be solved only when you understand the full significance of authority implied in a belief, i.e. why you want a guide, whether the guide is a Master or a priest, an experience, or a conviction and so on. This is the real issue which you are unwilling to face. If you can understand this, then, the infantile things like ceremonies will drop away; the systems, the whole economic and social snobberies will also disappear. Then, we will be creative human beings; we will have joy because every day is new, every minute there is an ending and therefore there is renewal. But to a man who is believing and seeks guidance, there is never a moment when there is an ending.

It will be a marvellous world when there is no preacher and the preached, when there is no teacher and the disciple. Then each person will be creative, each person will know the highest and live without craving for direction. After all, we seek guidance, either within or without, a Guru, an ideal, a memory - the memory being only the experience, the voice, the law, the Government, the Society, the Party, the Democratic or the Republican, the Socialist,

the Communist, the desire to seek guidance from a book, the Marx's, the Bhagavad Gita and so on.

I do not know if you see the extraordinary width of it, the vastness of this desire to find guidance, from the school-teacher in a little village to the autocratic and tyrannical boss of the State, from the man who has wealth to the petty little secretary of a small organisation.

Someone says that as intelligence varies in individuals, the less intelligent require some guidance from those who are more intelligent than they. One may be dull and not be so well educated and cunning as another. But, where do the dull and the clever meet so that they can come together and discuss? To have a meeting-ground, we say we will have a common guidance - God, or a common Guru, or a common idea. Though the ideal may be common for both of us, what is our relationship between each other? Our conception of the common ideal is different, as one is dull of understanding and the other clever. Therefore, they do not meet. Similarly, there is no meeting ground between you who are full of beliefs, ceremonies and rituals, and I who am without them.

You say that you and I are both seeking God when you are anchored in your beliefs and therefore cannot go far? Any two people can meet when they love each other. The man who loves another - his wife, his children, his friends, etc. - will not talk about ideals and beliefs.

What has happened to all the recent revolutions? They started out to establish the ideal of equality. This ideal was soon lost sight of. In the end, the man who is in authority has more power and more money than the man who is down below working in the

factory, and therefore, they never meet. The only place where they can meet is their hearts; but there is no love there. Love alone can establish equality between individuals.

Let us try and understand what guidance means and why you seek guidance. You are lost, you are confused, you are in turmoil, you do not know how to behave; you do not like that state and want to get out of it to clarity. Therefore, you approach somebody else for guidance, to seek direction. It is like a baby who seeks guidance from the mother or from the teacher because it does not know and it is curious to know the name of the bird or the name of the tree and so on. You look to that somebody to show you the way on conduct - economic, social, spiritual, physiological, biological, etc.

What is the relationship between you and me? You are aware that you are confused, confused in relationship, confused in ideas, confused in society which is already confused - religiously and psychologically - everywhere you are confused, everything is on the decline. So, you come and seek my guidance to get out from there, on all the different levels of consciousness. If this is correct, then, you have made me your guide. But, I refuse to be your guide; I say "Look at your confusion", which you refuse. Therefore, there is no relationship between us.

Guidance is a false relationship between any two, between God and yourself. To look at the confusion, you must free yourself from the idea of guidance. Before you can find out the meaning of confusion you must find out why you seek guidance. Because I refuse to be your guide, you will go to somebody else; I am not in competition with the other Gurus, but I want you to be free.

You seek guidance because you do not understand the confusion, the misery, the strife, the pain, etc; and you believe that somebody else will help you to understand; you go to him and expect him to resolve your confusion. Therefore, he becomes your guide. He tells you what to do. Gradually, your mind is filled with his ideas, his gestures, his words, etc. and he becomes all-important. Though you may say you have found the real Guru, the confusion is still there; only you have concentrated your attention on him, instead of on your confusion. Then, something happens and you feel lost again. You now say that your Guru is not such a nice Guru as you thought, and you go to another Guru. This is what has been happening for centuries.

Thus, in your everyday life, whenever you feel confused, you readily transfer your problem to another level - the Guru, the Book, the Leader, the Party, the System, the Idea. But, the problem of confusion is still there.

You are unwilling to face the problem and, being unwilling, you have sought an escape in somebody who will help you get out of the confusion. You have been practising for generations and generations to find a substitute to the problem. If you take a pill for indigestion and go on doing that, you depend on the pills and the pills become very important. Thus, your guides, the pills, have become important and not the problem. You started to clear the confusion and ended with the pills, escapes from confusion. So you have got now the confusion and the pill; and instead of dealing with one problem you have two problems now. So, you multiply the problems, instead of seeing the one problem, confusion.

When you are confronted with the two problems, the pill and



the confusion, what is your response? the pill has become more important than the problem itself; and so, the problem remains and the pill remains! When you are confronted by this, when you understand how the pill is only an escape and does not help you in solving the problem, the pill gets away. You do not have to throw it away, or choose different kinds of pills. There is no question of choosing. There will only be choice when you do not understand the significance of the pill. The moment you understand, the moment you see something as false, it drops away.

Then there is only the problem left, and there is no question of turning to the problem. In discussing this, you found that pills are distractions from the problem. You wander from one manufacturer to another, one Guru to another, and so your going from Guru to Guru has become important, not the problem. You do not want to understand the problem, because you believe the pill is going to solve it. But the problem is still there. If you see the significance of the pill, the pill is gone, and the problem remains.

Therefore, you must see the Truth in the false. The false are the pills, and the moment you see the truth of that, the false will drop away, and you do not have to see the latest pill.

When you realise that your beliefs and your guides are really escapes from the problem of your confusion, which still remains to be understood and solved, and that therefore they have no significance to you in regard to the solving of the problem, your guides drop away; and the problem of confusion alone confronts you, and you look at it whether it is painful, disagreeable or otherwise.

In this state, your mind is not distracted at all but quiet and

passively alert in observing the problem without any effort whatsoever, i.e., your mind is fresh because it has seen the false as false; it cannot therefore translate or interpret the problem but sees it as it is. Thus, the problem though old has become new, because it has not been faced before but only now. A new mind faces a new problem without any translation or interpretation according to a pattern, and it is eager to know all about it and, therefore, loves it. Love transforms even the most ugly. Where there is love, there is instantaneous communication, confusion ceases, there is clarity; and the problem thus ceases to exist.

## **MADRAS 22ND GROUP DISCUSSION 9TH DECEMBER, 1947**

Not only at the present time, but always, the fundamental truth is that man divides himself by beliefs, by systems. As nationalism divides human beings, beliefs break up friendship and create animosity. At the present time, when the world is in such a frightful chaos when all the values have disintegrated, when the so-called democracies are also leading up to regimentation, surely those who have thought about the cause of the misery and the antagonism that exists, should attempt to bring about a new society and not merely the reconstruction of the old, because the old cannot be patched-up and even if it is patched-up it will remain still the old.

As wisdom comes only with the knowledge of our everyday activities and feelings, we shall today take up the study of "evil" as a means of revealing the process of our own thinking. 'Evil' is a predominant factor in our daily life. All ideas are interrelated, and by examining one profoundly and following it through, you will see how extraordinarily interrelated they are.

Various philosophers in Europe and in this country and various religions, have thought over this problem of evil. Great men have given their life over to its study. But, you readily throw off explanations without any thinking. Let us enquire into this like mature people and understand its implications and its significance, so that we may be able to alter the conduct of our daily life.

It is no use thinking about 'evil' according to what is written about it in books or translating it according to our experience. Our

experience is itself "accumulated memory" which is always translating through the screen of personal advantages and gains. To understand a problem of enormous significance, like evil, your mind must be in a receptive mood. Just as the problem of labour cannot be understood if you approach it merely as a capitalist, or as a socialist, or a labourman, so also to understand the problem of evil, you must not approach it from any single point, such as a sense of guilt, personal experience, selfishness, etc.

You say that whatever hinders progress, is evil. What is progress, what is evolution? The cart-wheel has progressed to aeroplane; the germ has become the child. We have progressed from the age of the arrow to that of the atomic bomb. Now, we have more breaking up of people than ever, more armies, more national feeling, more fear and more starvation. People have become more greedy and more cunning in a cunning society and more competitive in a competitive society. In spite of the havoc and misery caused by the two world wars, many persons consider that war is inevitable and, in the nature of things, is a means to peace. Is all this progress?

We have to consider progress as a means of human happiness, i. e., as progress towards human love, consideration, generosity and charity. Have we evolved psychologically towards freedom and happiness? There is more and more deterioration all round - tyranny, dictatorship, diseases, starvation, hatred, wars and confusion.

You say that God has a plan and anything that interferes with that plan is evil. This is the old idea of a fight between God and the Devil.

Look about you, and see what is happening in nature. One bird destroys another bird, one animal leaps on another, the snake lives by its poison and the strong live on the weak. There is continual strife to live by any means. The snake is the most extraordinary animal developing its own poison for its self-protection. There is a kind of snake in Brazil which, to protect itself, becomes rigid like a bar of steel and cannot be bent. Perhaps a snake is not cruel or evil at all. We call a snake evil and kill it. Among us, the strong live on the weak, the clever live on the stupid. The capitalist is hoarding money and property at the expense of others. The books have said that they are evil, and yet we are doing that.

Inwardly, there is a battle between the opposites, between what I want and what I do not want. I am brutal and greedy and I do not want to be brutal and greedy.

We also want to survive physically as a person and also psychologically as the name, as an idea, etc.

Our everyday existence is confusion, ignorance, sorrow, pleasure, a constant battle, a constant strife. Has evil any relationship to this battle in us between the opposites or is it like Death, like God, like Truth, something apart from this everyday existence?

Is 'evil' an idea which is used by the society to control man so that he does not go beyond the limits? Organised religions have cultivated and controlled man by their laws through fear, through compulsion, through imitation, through fears of contradiction and has said 'You must be this'. When you go beyond those laws, they say it is evil. For instance, organised religion has never said that ambition is evil, but has always decried sex. Don't you see the

implications?

Does evil mean to you a conquering of some temptation? Buddha is supposed to have fought with "Mara" and won. Jesus is supposed to have been tempted by the devil and conquered it. Perhaps, we are thinking altogether wrongly, when we have the idea that there are evil forces in the world, the dark forces in opposition to the white forces.

So, to understand this, you must begin with yourself. You do something wrong and you have pain. There is a physiological suffering and a psychological suffering; they are not quite clear-cut. What is the cause of this suffering? Is it easily dissolved?

We need food, clothing and shelter. If I am satisfied with a few clothes, food and shelter, I will never come into conflict with another; but, if I use food, clothing and shelter as a means of psychological exploitation, I will come into conflict.

Some of you advocated suffering as a means to acquire intelligence. Is one to cultivate intelligence through suffering? Is not suffering an indication of ignorance? I suffer when my son dies, because I do not understand the implications of death. Do I sit down and find out the cause of suffering, or do I run away to seek relief from pain with the aid of a priest? If I want to go into the whole significance of death I must have intelligence. You say ignorance is a means of enlightenment; that is, suffer more and more, and you will become more and more intelligent. Do you become intelligent in that manner? Surely you will get intelligence only through understanding suffering, and not through mere suffering. So, when you say suffering brings intelligence it is not a fact. Through ignorance there can be nothing but ignorance.

Through wrong means you have only a wrong end.

As you have been constantly seeking escapes from suffering, you have become clever and intelligent in escapes; but you have not understood suffering. To understand suffering, you have to live with it. To find the cause of suffering, you must go into it and not reject suffering. Understanding will come only when you give your whole being to understand the problem. Is evil the denial of good? By denying evil, do you understand evil? To understand anything there must not be denial, nor condemnation, nor identification with it. Take, for example, God. I am not talking about what the books say or about the images in temples; that is not God. God is an unknown thing and therefore you must go to it with a free mind, without any conclusions or condemnations. So also, evil is not the denial of good. Beauty is not the denial of the ugly.

Is "evil" or "vice" or "the bad" the opposite of the good? Is good the opposite of evil?

Does not each opposite contain the germ of its own opposite? Is fear the opposite of bravery? If I am a coward I want to become brave. In doing so, instead of understanding fear, I have tried to become brave. Therefore, bravery has an element of fear in it.

You say that a man in war is doing his duty; but you forget that he is stuffed with propaganda of all kinds; he is told that his country will suffer, and he is stuffed with rum before he fights. Is this doing his duty? Even in the case of a mother loving her child, either she gives her life to it which is spontaneous, or it may be calculated, because, without the child, she is lost.

When I am stupid I want to become clever. Is not "becoming clever" a part of stupidity? There is conflict between what I am and

the thing which I want to be. The thing which I want to be is part of my own projection of stupidity. If I understood stupidity, then the problem ceases. The very awareness of the fact that I am stupid is the beginning of intelligence, and not trying to become clever. If I think in these terms, there is no opposite at all; the opposite may be a fabrication of the mind.

Has not non-greed the element of greed? When I am greedy positively in going after property, etc., I want to become non-greedy; I am still greedy negatively in going after non-greed. I find greed does not pay and, perhaps if I become non-greedy, it will pay - which is still greed in an uncreative form. You will never understand anything by thinking in terms of its opposite. Similarly, if I am evil and I try to become good, the good has the seed of evil. Instead of pursuing and creating the opposite, if I say 'All right, I am greedy, it is a fact', then, something happens and I cease to be greedy. The moment I recognise it, it falls away.



## **MADRAS 23RD GROUP DISCUSSION 11TH DECEMBER, 1947**

We were talking about evil in relation to the problem of duality and the conflict of the opposites, i.e. about what is going on in the world - left against the right, the believer against the non-believer, the communist against the capitalist, labour against capital, arrogance against humility, good against evil, etc. Now, is there such a thing as the opposites?

Someone of you said that good is that which gives the greatest happiness to the largest number of people. Is this so? The fighting men are extraordinarily delighted and happy if there is war. They are relieved of their responsibilities and they are told what to do. The greatest number of people like to believe in some kind of superstition, whether it is the superstition of nationality, or of race, superstition of a scientific man, or religious superstition. So, can we say good is what gives happiness to the most? Obviously not, nor what is harmful to the most is evil.

Is that the way of discovering the truth of anything, bringing in the utilitarian point of view? Is it not the correct way to view the thing as it is, and not be confused by its effect or action on the many or the one? Can we not think directly instead of bringing in its action, whether it is beneficial for the many or for the few? After all, the State decides what is good for the people, whether the right or the left, passes certain regulations and laws and says that he who obeys them is the good, and the person who is disobeying it is the evil.

Now, can you be called good when you are kind, merciful and

generous spontaneously? Why do we name it? If a good action is said to be an example for others to follow, is it good? It ceases to be mercy when somebody imitates mercy. Why do we create these words, good and evil?

Let us consider the left and the right. Is the left different from the right? The left is the idea that sensory values are the only values worth cultivating, giving happiness to man; and that, therefore, man through the control of environment can be shaped according to the edicts of society and the State; in that control there should be no values except the sensory values. The Socialist, the Fascist and the Communist believe in that; to them the individual is not at all important, because he is merely the result of sensory values, to be controlled and shaped, or to be transformed and moulded, according to the desire of the State or what the State wants.

Then, there is the so-called opposite to it, the right - the absolutest as opposed to the materialist - he has only an absolute value which is God, in which is involved the priest, the Church, the organisation. The capitalists who believe in the absolute value of God are sacrificing the individuals through exploitation, ruthless murderous exploitation, corruption and competition; during a crisis, like a war, they too adopt the same attitude towards the individual as the communist.

Similarly, the man who believes in the Church and who wants to spread religion as a means of salvation, believes in the good end and says "let us make this world as ruthlessly efficient as possible" and fights the man who is against the Church.

But are they - the Communist and the Capitalist, or the

Materialist and the Absolutist - the opposites? Is there the dual, the sensory and the non-sensory, as two in opposite? This is a problem confronting the people all over the world, the religious person who wants to spread religion and the other wanting to spread his external, materialistic, dialectic conclusions.

We are trying to find out whether the left is an opposite to the right, or is merely the extension of the right.

After all, without understanding the centre, the left or the right are the same. It is only when one understands the centre which is the individual from which the left and the right come into being, there can be true revolution, not revolution to the left or to the right. but, as long as you are thinking in terms of the left or the right, you cannot understand the centre.

The problem now is not whether the left is right or the right is wrong, but whether opposites exist, i.e. the problem of thesis and antithesis, "this" opposed to "that". Is there such a problem, the capitalist opposed to the communist, the communist opposed to the religious, that which is in contradiction to that which is not?

You are this and you want to be that; you are ignorant and you want to be enlightened; you are arrogant and you want to be humble. Or you are ambitious and ruthless, and you carry on. Thus your whole existence is a conflict of opposites. All your religious books and edicts are based on 'You are this and you must become that.' Are you satisfied with this struggle of opposites? The clerk becoming the manager and the manager becoming the executive, is our whole everyday struggle. Should you not question it to find out the reason for this conflict, this ceaseless battle till you die and to be still wanting to continue after death?

The conflict of the opposites exists in all the different layers of our existence - social, economic, political, inward, psychological, spiritual and so on. This is a constant battle between 'what you are' and 'what you would like to become'. As an example covering the whole of life - i.e. the Clerk becoming the Manager, the Priest becoming the Bishop, the Collector becoming the Governor, the ignorant becoming the enlightened, evil becoming the good and so on - let us consider 'arrogance'. I am arrogant and I spend my energy in becoming humble, adopting meditations, beliefs and ceremonies as helps to keep me on in this conflict of 'becoming' the opposite of 'what I am'. I have accepted this process of 'becoming' as the way of life, thoughtlessly and without any investigation, thinking it to be inevitable because all the religious people have told me like that. Is that the way to live? In order to understand the truth about this, I should not accept any contradiction, though I am caught in contradiction; but I must put it aside.

Someone says that, in order to bring about peace, you must go to war, if necessary, with the anti-social people. He believes, therefore, that war is a means to peace. In order to fight the communist or the capitalist, you must be as clever as he and should employ all his methods, his ways, his propaganda, and his ways of telling lies, i.e. you have to become himself. England has fought for years for the freedom of labour and now directs it. Our whole existence is this, fighting evil by evil means, but saying, 'Well, I am not evil,' as though we are extraordinarily righteous. Wrong means will surely produce a wrong end.

In our everyday life, we have thoughtlessly accepted as inevitable this struggle of opposites - I am this and I want to

become that - without knowing the whole significance of 'what I am'; so, the end also is bound to be thoughtless.

It is thoughtless on the part of an arrogant man to struggle to become humble; he will never become humble. What does 'to become' mean? 'I am this' and 'I want to become that.' 'I am arrogant' is a fact and I know it. But 'humility' I do not know; it is an objective which I would like to be. Humility, therefore, is not the actual; but the ideal. That is one part of the problem. The other part of the problem is the idea of becoming.

Is there a becoming at all? I know the acorn becomes the oak; this is not a becoming; it is what it is all the time and it has its own becoming. There is no becoming of an acorn into the rose or the pine tree. If you can understand the problem of becoming, then perhaps you will discover the truth about duality.

You are 'A', and you want to become 'B'. Now, what is 'B'? Is it not a negative response to what is 'A'? You are arrogant and the negative response is humility and you must become that. That is, you are arrogant; and negatively you are going to become that which is humble. You find arrogance not so pleasurable as you thought it was, because there is pain involved and arrogance does not pay you; perhaps becoming humble will pay you. Thus, 'becoming' implies a profit motive.

You say that you, being arrogant, want to become humble because then only can you get to God. This means that you want a result which is more beneficial, less harmful, and happier than arrogance. The real motive for a 'becoming' is for a profit, not only physiologically, but psychologically. You are 'arrogant,' the 'A'; and you want to get away from that. You begin to say that

arrogance does not pay and therefore you create humility, the 'B'; you try to become that which is non-existent, as 'B' is non-existent but theoretical and ideological. You have created the opposite 'B' which is non-existent and yet you are trying to become that. 'A' alone, arrogance, is existent. Because it is not profitable you want to become the opposite which is humility. When you examine the opposite and you see what is involved in it, you see that you have created it as a negative response. Therefore, in creating the opposite, the opposite has the seed of arrogance. 'B' has the seed of 'A' because 'B' has been brought into being through 'A'. It is only an ideological thing which is to be got and it is not existent apart from A. So, you have found out that the conflict between 'A' and 'B' is fallacious and does not lead you anywhere.

As another illustration of this conflict of opposites, let us take 'fear' and 'bravery'. You are afraid and you want to become brave, because fear does not pay in the world and everybody says you must be brave; which means, you want to become brave because you are afraid. The motive is still fear. Though you have taken the cloak of bravery, there is still fear. The intention in becoming brave is still fear. Therefore, bravery, as the opposite of fear, has the seed of fear.

Similarly about anger. We are not discussing how to get rid of anger. First, we must know what we are doing before we get rid of anger. You are angry and what is your response? You said to another something sharp and you regret; and you say 'I wish I did not get angry'. Again, you are angry and again you say "Awful, what is the matter?" and you create the opposite which is non-anger, because anger is very disturbing. If you can understand the

conflict of the opposites, you may be able to deal with anger quite differently.

You are in a state which is very disturbing and you do not like that state. You like the state which is quite peaceful and more profitable. Therefore, you are moving from 'what you are' to 'what you want to be' as the opposite of 'what you are', with a motive for profit. The opposite is created on account of your desire for profit or benefit, for a result; it is non-existent. Therefore, the fight between the so-called opposites is between 'what is' and 'what is not'. How can there be a fight between one which is existent and some-thing which is non-existent apart from it? It is only on the verbal level. Therefore, the fight is an illusion, a stupid and thoughtless action.

Conflict between the opposites - whether it is the left or the right, between capital and labour, between God and Devil, is non-existent: because, there is only one thing, 'what is': and any movement away from 'what is' is stupidity. Therefore, the conflict has no significance.

To understand the disturbing state in which you find yourself, you must first stop the fighting with the opposite which is non-existent, i.e. you must give up the struggle to become the opposite. Do not condemn that state nor identify yourself with it. Then, watch it with your whole being and be aware of it.

Whenever we have a feeling, we generally name it so that we may recognise it and also communicate it, if necessary, to others. Investigation into and understanding of the feeling itself, which is changing and in movement, demands freedom from terminology, as the term is not the thing that it is supposed to denote.

If a feeling is investigated through a term, the term becomes important and not the feeling. When communicated to another, that other interprets the term or the word according to his own feeling. Thus, the term influences, modifies, and shapes the feeling. For the same reasons, the word 'God' is not 'God' and yet it has become an extraordinarily important word. We shall discuss further this question of terminology in relation to feelings, at our next meeting.



## **MADRAS 24TH GROUP DISCUSSION 13TH DECEMBER, 1947**

Before we begin with our discussion where we left off, it is very important to bear in mind why we meet as, otherwise, these discussions will deteriorate into mere intellection without any significance. I think one should distinguish between hearing inside oneself and listening. Listening is surely something outside. Hearing is much more subjective. Let us hear each other rather than listen to each other. These discussions are really meant to reveal the way of our own thinking, feeling and acting. Right thinking begins only in discovering what is exactly taking place in each one of us - the illusions, the vicious motives, the intentions; being aware of all these leads to right thinking - i.e., through self-knowledge only can right thinking come into being and not through any book, not through any listening to a talk but by being aware of every movement of thought and feeling in ourselves.

We were discussing, when we last met, about the problem of duality, whether this conflict was inevitable - this conflict between ignorance and knowledge, between arrogance and humility, anger and peace, capitalism and communism, the left and the right, and so on. This conflict between the opposites has apparently been accepted by us as an inevitable fact in our life.

Is life meant to be a series of conflicts in the corridor of opposites or is our approach to the problem of the opposites wrong? If the opposites are inevitable, then the end of life is also a battle because an opposite always creates its opposite. I am something and I want to become something else. I am arrogant and

I strive to become humble; I am violent, and I want to become non-violent; I am greedy and I strive to become non-greedy. That is what we have been doing in our meditations and in our daily existence.

Now, is the opposite a fact? Does the opposite exist apart from its opposite, as humility, as non-greed, as non-violence and so on? Is not every opposite a reaction to and result of its own opposite? As humility is a result of arrogance, humility contains the germ of arrogance. You find arrogance is not profitable and is a disturbing factor; and you have been told that arrogance is taboo socially, morally, and religiously; and therefore you strive to become humble which is more profitable. So your motive is still the desire to gain, the desire to become something. So humility contains the seed of arrogance.

Now, the fact is that arrogance is existent, but the 'being non-arrogant or humble' is not a fact. Humility is existent only in theory but actually is not. The 'A' being arrogance creates 'B' which is humility; but the 'B' in itself is non-existent apart from 'A'. 'B' cannot exist apart from 'A'. So the conflict to become 'B' is illusory and fallacious. If you recognise the conflict to be non-essential and false, then the conflict ceases.

If good is the opposite of bad, goodness contains the bad because goodness is the result of its opposite, the bad. I am bad and I want to become good. The becoming good is the outcome of being bad. Therefore, it is still bad though I call it good. I accept this becoming good as long as it is profitable, as long as there is no suffering in it. The moment I suffer and the moment I realise that being bad is forbidden socially and religiously, then I try to

become good. So, behind that becoming there is still the motive to gain a more profitable quality. Therefore, the good, which is the opposite of bad, is no longer good. If love is the opposite of hate, surely it is not love. If peace is the opposite of violence, then it is no longer peace because my trying to become peaceful is due to my finding that violence does not pay any more; the motive is still the same. If love is the opposite of hate, then it is the result of hate. Therefore, the conflict between the opposites is really a fallacious conflict; though we indulge in that, it does not lead us anywhere. If this is realised and understood, the conflict ceases.

Why do we name any quality? Perhaps, if we do not name it or term it, it may have a different significance. A quality arises in me, which I term as arrogance; and I either approve of it or condemn it. If I do not term it and if I do not specify the quality, what would happen?

Is the feeling different from the term, or does the term give significance to the feeling? That is, is the feeling apart from the term, or do I look at the feeling through the term?

The word is not the thing. the word 'God' is not God, and therefore the term is independent of God though you may call it God. The term has nothing to do with Reality. If the feeling and the term are two separate things, then in observing the term and understanding the process of how the term comes into being, perhaps we shall not confuse it with the feeling; then the feeling will have a different meaning, a different significance.

You have accepted the term God as God through temples, priests and sacred books; and so they have become important to you. If somebody says that what you have accepted for years as

God is not God, it gives you a shock, the shock being the nervous response, a sense of nervous apprehension. But when you see that the term is not the thing, you are free of the shock. If you understand and realise that the term God is not God it has an extraordinary nervous and verbal response in you; you are free of all the implications of the word God being accepted as God. Then the temples will have no meaning, whether we go to it or do not go, because the term is not the God; therefore we are at once free from all priests, temples, churches and so on. There is no conflict of any going and worshipping in a temple, because the image is not the Real and if you really worship, the image disappears. This can have action only when the response is nervous as well as verbal. But, unfortunately, your understanding is only verbal because if you say the word is not the thing and carry it out, you will have to go into conflict with your family and with society.

The term is not the feeling though it is made to represent the feeling.

Why is a quality or feeling named? The naming is done with a view (i) to convey or communicate the quality to others and (ii) to pin down or to evaluate the quality. In pinning down the new quality, the quality is recognised and evaluated in terms of the old frame of references based on memory. As the feeling itself is in the present and therefore new, whereas the references into which it is fitted by naming it relate to the past, the new is interpreted and modified in terms of the old, thus strengthening memory, i.e. the 'me'. The quality or feeling is thus absorbed into the 'me' and is given continuance in time as memory.

Without memory, there cannot be evaluation. The frame of

references is the result of evaluation which is based on memory; so, it is the old. The feeling, when it arises, is new and in the present; when that feeling is termed, it is translated or modified so as to fit it into the old framework of references, memory, thus strengthening memory. So, in giving a term to the feeling, the 'me' is strengthened; and the person concerned feels stronger psychologically; when he says "this is my property", he feels already more powerful.

What would happen to a feeling if you did not judge it by the frame of reference - i.e. if you do not name verbally that feeling or quality? When there is response to a challenge, if you name the response, you give it continuance because it is absorbed into the frame of references. Consciousness in all its different layers is memory, whether it is the memory of the Paramatman or of anything else; and all such memory is the result of your parents and grandparents and so on, or the result of books; consciousness is still in the field of memory, you cannot think of Paramatman without memory.

Now, suppose a reaction arises and you do not name it. Then, you do not absorb it into consciousness, but you are merely aware of it; the feeling and the response or reactions would cease after running their course; the feeling is not judged or evaluated and it is not absorbed into memory.

We are all accustomed to name every reaction and refer it to the frame of references, memory, almost instinctively. But if you experiment with it and refuse to name a feeling when it arises in you, you will see that there is a time-lag, between the feeling and the naming. For instance, if a man treads on your feet, you have the

reaction of pain, which is inevitable and cannot be helped; but you do not hit back the man who has trodden on your feet. When you refuse to name it, though the reaction is there, it is not put into the frame of references. The pain has now a different significance. Next time you will be more careful where you put your feet. Thus, by understanding the reaction, you would be observant and alert and be aware of what is actually taking place without the framework of references. This is intelligence.

We have now discovered that we are always fighting reactions without understanding their significance; and if we do not name them, i.e. if we do not refer them to the framework of references, they wither away. This happens whether the qualities are pleasurable or painful.

Generally you accept the pleasurable and deny the non-pleasurable. When you deny the non-pleasurable, you are really strengthening yourself. The man who says he is seeking spiritual things, God, is also denying and pursuing the pleasurable.

There is very little difference between him and the ordinary man who is seeking pleasure. They are both seeking pleasure though in different planes of consciousness; the one seeks gratification through God and the other seeks pleasure through drink.

At present there is an increase, all over the world, in sensate values - more theatres, more cinemas, more drinks, more clothes, more and more. The so-called spiritual man, seeing this, says 'I do not like it', and follows his ideation; that is, he denies the sensate and goes after the ideation, as the ideation gives him pleasure. Thus, the spiritual man is also following the pleasurable, like the

man of the sensate.

The man who is pursuing sensate values is destroying the world; he is saying that there is nothing more than the sensate and therefore is indulging in the sensate in the most irresponsible manner regardless of the consequences on others. This has been shown over and over again by wars after wars. We say that such a man is a stupid man, materialistic, communistic and so on; and we try to get rid of him and to pursue our ideations.

The man of the sensate and the man of the ideational are meeting at the same point, both their values are based on the senses, though the man who says he is following the ideation may do less harm in society. Obviously the sensate man does harm to the society; and the man of ideation is also creating harm, only on a different level because he has confused the term with Reality and the term becomes very important - your God and my God, your ceremonies and my ceremonies, or I am Brahmin and you are an Untouchable, which are the results of ideation.

So, just as the sensate man creates havoc in the world, the man of ideation with a framework of references also creates mischief; in fact, the latter does more harm. We can deal with a sensate man, because he is pursuing his pleasure through things; most of such men are poor and have very little means. The man who is pursuing ideation is much more dangerous, as he is pursuing pleasure through his ideas and as ideas divide man more than things. The Left and the Right are pursuing ideas and not things. If they were pursuing things, they would give us things.

Because the ideational man is pursuing the idea, he creates division between belief and belief, man and man; if he really gives

his concern to men and to things, he would organize society on a different basis; there would not be your belief as something superior to mine. But he would not do that because his ideas are more important. The system becomes more important than distribution and there is wrangling. It is not the things that are dividing man, but ideas. If that is understood, life would become very simple.

There is scientific skill in the world to produce things for everybody. There is knowledge at the disposal of man to produce enough food, clothing and shelter; but the ideas of nationalities such as the Americans, the English, the Germans, the Russians and so on, are preventing man from making it effective. Therefore there is this mess and misery in the world.

If I say "I will begin to understand the sensate", I can proceed step by step into the deeper things. Then, I can find out whether there is Reality or not. But to assume Reality is an idea which leads to illusion.

Just as the word, 'God' is not God, so the term for a feeling is not the feeling. When we do not put a feeling in the framework of references, the feeling comes to an end, withers away. When we do not term our feelings at all, both the painful feelings as well as the pleasurable feelings, the mind will be still and there would be no reference to the framework of memory and the feelings wither away.

Thus, the conflict of duality exists only when there is the naming of the feelings, and if we do not term the feelings, there is freedom from the conflict. What is then important for you is to find out, in our daily life, the truth of this, and then you will be content



with a more peaceful and serene and intelligent life. When you come to that point you can find out the significance of life, what it really means to love, and not its dictionary meaning, not a philosophical meaning for you to follow. When we come to that point, we can talk of other subjects like dreams, whether the Communist is right or the Rightist is right, and so on.

The understanding of Truth gives freedom and therefore happiness.

## **MADRAS 25TH GROUP DISCUSSION 16TH DECEMBER, 1947**

I wonder how far you have been experimenting with what we have been discussing, namely, the problem of conflict and effort which brings about duality, the opposite, and the problem of terming a feeling. I wonder what has been the result of it and whether it has any fundamental effect on your daily activities. Do you translate into action anything that you hear or do you just let it pass by?

Today, let us try and find out the meaning or the significance of 'not terming a feeling' in relationship, whether with your family, your boss, or your clerk - in your daily life.

Can you live in relationship with another without naming a feeling? Let us suppose that you are really serious in experimenting with this in your relationship, for instance, with your wife. What will this lead to? You are irritated with your wife when she says something which you do not like. You retaliate. A few minutes later, you say to yourself, "Well, what about the discussions I had in regard to 'not naming a feeling'? I will not name the feeling in future." Similar occasions arise again. Then, if you experiment with this earnestly, you will find that the time-interval between the instinctive responses and your thoughtful responses gradually gets less and less, and that, in the end, you do not instinctively respond, but you watch yourself and do not name the feeling that arises in you, with the result that you do not get cross with your wife. You are now calm and quiet whatever your wife may say or do. Your wife will probably get more and more irritated with you on this account; she is not thinking along the same lines as yourself. At

this stage you may turn away from sensate values, but your wife may be caught only in sensate values. She feels miserable; she feels thwarted because she does not get the things she wants. She has children; yet she does find love in them and therefore seeks an expression of love in things - car, house and other things of life. You try to talk over matters with her but she refuses to listen to you and becomes firm in her stand for things. What do you do?

A friend advises you to effect a compromise with her by handing over your cheque-book to her. You try this method. She does not want your cheque-book because what she wants is your heart which you are not giving her. You find that compromise is only an intellectual and verbal balance between two people who do not understand each other but who are tied by social conventions, and that, therefore, compromise is slow death.

You get exasperated and begin to talk over the matter with her seriously. She retorts and says to you "I want a car, a house, and a few things of life, because I know you are slipping from me. You have not given me your love. You are now slipping away from me into a realm which I cannot possibly understand and enter. I would like to follow you but I cannot. I have a child to look after. I have no love, if I had love, it would have filled my heart. I have not got that love at all and the love of the child is very little; the child does not know of love and it only clings to me. I have not the love which replenishes and fulfils my life. So, the child, the house and the car have become enormously important to me. I am quite different physically from you because I bear children. I am therefore more conservative and I want security. Emotionally, I am not so concentrated as you are. We have not loved each other and

so the child has become all important. When I grow old and the children go away, what shall I be left with? An aching memory, a drudgery kitchen, an ailing husband who does not know what it means to love; and a frustrated life. I am even now feeling frustrated. That is why I am irritable, nervous and anxious. You are going one way and I another way. Where do we meet? We have never met except in bed; now, there is not even that. You sought pleasure with me to further your name, and I became your cook and bearer of children. You are now trying to educate me, which you never did before. You are now more and more alert. So, I have become anxious. You now talk of love and all the rest of it but you have no love for me. You do not understand me at all."

Now, you realise the need for your wife and yourself to understand each other. When you sincerely begin to understand her, you will have consideration and affection for her. You will try to find out all about her, her physical condition and her nervous responses. In understanding her, you will understand her desire for things. With mutual understanding there will be love; and the problem will then cease. Thus you will find that, if you do not term the feelings, the implications are extraordinarily significant in relation to your wife or in relation to society, whether Communist, Capitalist, or something else.

What is your relationship to property or things, if you do not name or give a term to a feeling, whether pleasant or unpleasant? You all own property. You all have titles, B.A., M.A., Judge, Doctor, etc. What will happen to your feeling of ownership - 'my' property, 'my' wife, 'my' son, 'my' title - if you adopt this suggestion of 'not naming the feeling' and relate it to daily actions

in which there is the feeling of ownership of possession?

If you are not naming a quality or terming a feeling, then the feeling dies away. Similarly, if that quality which we call acquisitiveness is not termed, the acquisitiveness withers away. When you do not name the feeling, then life becomes very simple.

Naming a feeling is giving it continuity whether it is pleasurable or painful. How do you relate it to your property? If you change your name into "Swami something," it means only that name is more important. But, what happens when I drop my name, not literally, but when the content behind the name has completely gone out of it? I am not lost if somebody calls me by another name, but you are; because round the name there is a feeling - the ancestral, Brahmanic, etc., the feeling of property which you are going to leave your son - which is the very thing which you deny verbally, theoretically, when you want not to name a feeling. But you are attached to your name because of the content behind the name or title.

To name a feeling, whether it is pleasurable or painful, is to give it continuity, to give birth to itself repeatedly. If you are serious in the search after Truth, you are bound to drop the naming with regard to property which is bank-account, cheque-book, the stored up money, etc.

Generally you are concerned only with words and not with feelings. If I flatter you, you are pleased and if I insult you, you get annoyed. Should not a wise man be indifferent to flattery and insult?

If I am not a scoundrel and somebody calls me a scoundrel I want to find out, I want to discover whether he is correct. If I am a

scoundrel and somebody calls me as such, and if I do not want to be discovered as one, I get annoyed. In other words, this irritation is a process of self-protectiveness. The proper attitude is for me to know in what way you think me a scoundrel.

Similarly, the use of titles is a form of exploitation. Mrs. Smith, if she calls herself Lady Smith, gets better treatment. She finds others snobbish and she wants to exploit their snobbishness by using titles.

How are you to deal with property? Can you give up your property by saying that you are not going to name your property? You say that you will use your property only for your needs and that you will discourage acquisitiveness.

It is a wrong question to ask where to draw the line between needs and acquisitiveness, because you will have always needs. Acquisitiveness creates needs. You can find this out for yourself when you go to a shop.

Then there is the use of property as a means of self-expansion, and the use of an organisation as a means of self-fulfilment. You belong to a certain society, a certain group because that group of people have property, shelter or an idea which is extraordinarily useful to you. So, belonging to an organisation whether it is the Hindu or the Muslim and so on, is for self-expansion. If all these things drop away, you would be happy people; you would not be merely talking about brotherhood, but you would spread kindness and would love others.

Now your love is concentrated in property and, therefore, you have little love for persons. Naming the property, ie identifying and giving continuance to the feeling of acquisitiveness, is one of the

problems which is creating terrible havoc in the world. The man who uses a title, who is acquisitive, can never be happy, never be brotherly, though he may talk about brotherhood and happiness. Mere giving up of property or title, outwardly, will not solve the problem; you can give up the content of property or title only when you understand its whole significance. If you do not understand the whole significance, the remnants of acquisitiveness will still remain in the mind. This is really difficult because, psychologically, you are the property. Without it, where are you? The moment you let it go, you feel lost. To let go name, title, and property requires an extraordinary inward richness; it means freedom from outward things; you can let them go only when you have something real in yourself. You do not let them go for the simple reason that the property is you, the title is you, the name is you; this means the sensory things are you. The moment you do not identify your name, do not give a name to that feeling of being lost or being nobody, it comes to an end. Then the property will drop away and you will not care two pins.

So, the emphasis is not on property - which the Communist, the Socialist, or the Capitalist is emphasising - but it is on the significance property has for you. When you have inward riches, property does not matter; and there can only be inward riches when you do not name the feeling; through that door you find the imperishable. The man who is talking about the imperishable and is naming his feelings is a hypocrite.

It is only when you do not name your property, acquisitiveness will cease to be. Then, you will know the difference between the needs and acquisitiveness. You need food, clothing and shelter.

But, when you seek psychological satisfaction through property, name or title, they are no longer needs but become potent factors in making you more and more ruthless in acquisitiveness.

From this, you will see that only when you would understand the whole significance of not naming feelings in relation to title, property and relationship with others, and when you do not name such feelings in your daily life, there will be a rich transformation within yourself whereby you will bring about a creative society.



## **MADRAS 26TH GROUP DISCUSSION 18TH DECEMBER, 1947**

On the last occasion, we found that the conflict of the opposites is really fallacious, because the opposite is the non-existent, which has been created from 'what is'; and that the becoming into something other than 'what is' is the opposite; we also discussed the whole significance of terming a feeling, the reaction to a challenge, and that from that naming there are a series of reactions and in these reactions we get lost. So, the becoming is the conflict. Then the naming of the feeling is perhaps wrong because the feeling is new but it is put in the framework of references, thereby interpreting the new feeling through the framework of old references and therefore misinterpreting the feeling. If I had not termed it perhaps I would have a different reaction to the feeling, and the feeling may then subside. A feeling which is termed, whether unpleasant or pleasant, can come to an end if you do not name it, then you will see that it withers away. But, is love a feeling which, when not named, will come to an end? We have discussed further about terming a feeling and what effect it has in our daily life. We also discussed about property and what happens if we do not name it.

(Then the discussion went back to the question of belief, ceremonies, etc., which had already been discussed in detail, as these questions were brought up again by someone present.)

## **MADRAS 27TH GROUP DISCUSSION 20TH DECEMBER, 1947**

You have suggested that, today, we should discuss together the practical steps to be taken by us in our daily life to give expression to the ideas we have hitherto considered, especially in relation to property.

Property implies continuity, acquisitiveness, possessiveness, domination, suppression, economic relation between man and man, ill-will, nationalism, war and peace and all the rest of it.

We consider practical steps in order to achieve an ideal, to achieve something, to achieve a result. This suggestion implies that what we have been discussing is impractical and that, being only theoretical, they need translation in our daily life through a certain set of regulations or practical ideas. It also implies that we do not understand the implications of that idea in regard to our daily activities now, and that by doing certain practices leading to a particular way of living, you will, in course of time, understand the implications.

Let us take, for instance, nationalism. How can you be practical about nationalism? If you understand it and its results in daily life, it drops away from you. You do not become international; you cease to be national and therefore you are a human being. How can you have a practical step to cease to be national?

Either we understand nationalism and its implications immediately and it drops away; or we do not understand and we think that, by doing certain actions, we will understand later. We know that nationalism causes separatism, exclusiveness, friction,

ill-will and enmity. It acts as a barrier between people and prevents sane living. If I have more than I need of property, names, titles, etc, then they will cause envy. Similarly, if I say I am an Indian, I am a Hindu, and my whole patriotism is given to India, I am exclusive. It is the process of exclusiveness which ultimately leads to war.

Or you say that you must go through separation, through nationalism, in order to become international. That is, you must first be a Hindu and yet become brotherly with other people who call themselves by different names. Is that possible? If you call yourself a Hindu and I call myself a German, can we two meet as brothers? You keep your nationality and I keep my nationality; and can we two meet? Obviously we cannot, because we are more concerned with our names than with being really human. So you see the fallacy of saying that through nationalism we can become international though lots of people talk of it.

Nationalism in itself is an exclusive process and it is of recent growth caused by competition, economic frontiers, etc. It is not conducive to peace. The more you are national, the more you are identifying yourself with what you call your country in order to be something. If you are nobody you feel rather frustrated. One of the effects of industrialisation is to make you more and more mechanical and less and less important.

How can you be more practical if you do not see the significance of nationalism in all its different layers so that it may drop away of its own accord? If you have the intelligence to see that it is a cobra, you do not have to take practical steps to fight it. You just leave it alone. You want to have open relationship with

others; you also see that nationalism is a poison which has degenerating effects in human relationship. Therefore nationalism drops away. You may have a little reaction when you hear that India beat Australia in cricket, but it does not become a problem.

So, your difficulty lies in seeing the thing clearly without any prejudice. The prejudice has been created by outside agencies as well as yourself. With regard to every subject, you are misinformed, you are badly educated and badly conditioned; and you try to interpret life through this misinformation. When you realize that your information is wrong you immediately put it aside.

You like to identify yourself with your country because it gives you a sense of warm feeling which can be whipped up to kill somebody. You become national and you like it because it gives you a warm sense of feeling that you are achieving something. So there are more soldiers, more armies, more dreadfulness. That is what we are achieving and that is not progress. Progress does not obviously lie through bloodshed.

There are only six countries, I believe, that can feed themselves; every other country is dependent on somebody else. Therefore, why not destroy all the frontiers and come together as human beings to meet our necessities of food, clothing and shelter? You want to know who is to do this. You and I have to do this. Who else is going to do it? Certainly not the capitalists, certainly not the political party - either the Left or the right - because they are committed. So, who is to do it except those people who see the thing clearly?

Nationalism is a modern invention, and it is really non-

conducive to peace; it acts as a barrier between people. There is no practical step regarding it; either you see the thing or you do not. Your prejudices stand in the way of your finding it out.

You must see the whole significance of the idea of acquisitiveness which is expressed through property, through relationship and through ideation. I am not talking about merely the ethical, the moral or the religious, but the actual process of acquisition and what is implied in it. What are the effects of acquisitiveness? One is nationalism and another is the competition between you and me; another is the moral and social degradation in which is involved the whole idea of division of the high and the low.

Psychologically, it is very gratifying to own something; it feeds your vanity, you are somebody then. The effect of acquisition gives you a sense of life, a sense of struggle, a sense of existence. If you do not acquire what are you? You are nobody if you have no title, no property, or no name; and therefore things become important. Because inwardly you are nothing, you wish to acquire, which implies power, prestige, title and all the rest of it.

Then, mentally, you want to acquire knowledge. You are anchored to acquisition and you become a mental addict who always reads. A mind that is merely acquiring, ceases to function as an instrument of thought, it inevitably becomes dull without any pliability, it is slavish, it is uncreative, it is repetitive because it is merely acquiring what it calls knowledge. So, acquisition through experience, through memory or through knowledge and all the rest of it, is really a factor that dulls the mind and cripples thinking. To think, you must be free and not be anchored to acquisition, to

property or to belief.

You may have no property, but mentally you may be anchored to acquisition, a mental addict who reads and reads. You should understand the significance of acquisition which is expressed in property, which does not mean that you must not have a little money, especially as the society around you is based on money. Some property, i.e. food, clothes, and shelter, is necessary for you and you must have it; but it should not become a psychological need.

When you understand the significance of acquisitiveness, it is very simple to deal with property. You may prevent, by legislation, the acquisition of property; but people may still be acquisitive in some other direction, which may be equally disastrous, like knowledge which gives one an extraordinary sense of superiority. What is the practicability wanted here? The problem is how to give up the property or how to arrange the property to suit your convenience. You can only deal with it when you understand the full significance of it. What is your attitude to property? Are you depending on legislation with regard to your conduct toward property? The world is confused; and the more it is confused, the more the individual wants security, i.e. you want to be secure. This leads to conflict in you as well as outside you. This conflict will cease only when you understand and are aware of the significance of acquiring property; then there will not arise the question of how you will escape from the conflict.

There are various forms of relationship - such as relationship with things which are considered to be property, relationship to the bank account, relationship to law which sustains the property; and

the relationship to human beings. The relationship to human beings is more difficult and more subtle; and the difficulty arises when there is no love. Love cannot be learned through Pelmanism, through practice, or through following some steps. If there is love, you will understand relationship; love will then show the way out of this horrible mess of husband and wife and relationship between man and man. Why don't we love? What is preventing us from loving? If you can find out the cause, perhaps you may know how to love. Love is not something abstract, but it is an extraordinary sense of intelligence, a heightened form of intelligence. If you are intelligent then perhaps there will be love.

Why is it that the relationship between man and man has become so difficult? It may be because they are not dealing with it intelligently and they do not know what intelligence is. Perhaps you can find out what intelligence is, negatively.

My relation with you is society. The society is non-existent without you and me. The group is you and me; you and I create the whole structure of society. When we examine the relationship between one another now, we find there is conflict. Average existence is a conflict. To deal with this conflict intelligently, I must examine the relationship as it is and not as I would like it to be.

I notice conflict in my relationship with my wife. To understand this, I must, first of all, know if I am related at all. If I am related, there should be communion, exchange of feeling and thinking out of the problem together. To be is to be related. I have taken it for granted that I am related to my wife; perhaps I am not. There is no real contact with her so I remain isolated. Yet, I think I am in

relationship with her; and so, 'relationship' may be merely an expression or a term without any meaning because if I am related to her, it will have a different meaning.

Can two entities in isolation live together? If my whole motive is to be self-protected, is there any relationship? So, the problem is not that I do not love her or she does not love me, or she dominates over me; but perhaps she and I are not related for the very simple reason that she is exclusive in herself and I am exclusive in myself. That is our daily activity - I with my interests and my purposes and she with hers. We say we are related, but we two are working exclusively in ourselves. Therefore the next question is: why am I doing it?

It is suggested that common interest brings about communion. Is it so? You and I are interested in education, we both have common interests and we belong to the same society. We meet in the temple; but, in the market, we cut each other's throat.

Why does each one of us, in our relationship with one another, try to isolate oneself? Is this inevitable in the sense of a rose becoming a rose? Is this process natural? If it is natural or inevitable, then there is nothing more to be said about it, and there will be constant conflict between you and me; there will be no peace between you and society, between you and myself. If it is inevitable, there can never be love, not a moment of complete quietness between us. We know of moments when there is creation, though such moments are rare. Creation takes place not in conflict but only when the conflict ceases, when there is silence, when there is a sense of fullness. So, we find that the conflict is not inevitable. We have now to understand why we isolate ourselves in



relationship.

It is said in all religious literature that, to find God, you must withdraw and be alone. When you seek God, Reality, Truth, you are alone not because you want to be alone but because a lot of stupid people around you force you to be alone. You say nationalism is wrong, Brahmanism is wrong, etc.; but society will not accept all this because it does not like to change. So, though you do not push yourself away from it, the society pushes you out and then says that you must be alone to find out Truth.

Nobody can be alone; he is always in relationship with the person who gives him food. He is alone only in repudiating the faiths and refusing the things which society accepts. So, it is a wrong conclusion leading to illusion, that you must be alone to find God. I now see that I would be acting falsely if I am isolating myself because society has been telling me that I should be alone to find Reality.

On examining further, we find that one of the reasons for exclusion is labour, functional existence. We are isolating ourselves according to function. Functions have become very important in our life for the very simple reason that our life is based on sensate values. Through functions, I am isolating myself because I have divided life into categories of functions, higher and lower, like minister and scavenger, etc.

Why are we isolating psychologically? I am living in isolation and my whole struggle is to live in more and more isolation. I live with my neighbour and he is also doing exactly the same as I am doing. I know that isolation is not an inevitable process. Then why do I psychologically isolate myself? My strife is to protect myself.

Similarly you are protecting yourself. This means mutual self-protection for avoiding a conflict.

But, we have not understood self-protection. After all, any enclosure, psychological or physical, is self-protection, is isolation. I put a wall around myself, psychologically, for the obvious reason to protect myself. The more I try to protect myself, the greater the isolation, the greater is the conflict. Protecting myself by putting a wall psychologically around me creates a barrier. You have a wall around you and I have a wall around me and we keep on strengthening our respective walls. When you and I thus come in contact, what will be our relationship? The more I am enclosed in myself the more violent I become, the more aggressive I am; similarly you.

To have right relationship, this barrier of psychological enclosure around each one of us has to be pulled down. Obviously, as I cannot do anything with others, I must first start with myself and set about to pull down the enclosure which I am putting up around me for self-protection.

## **MADRAS 28TH GROUP DISCUSSION 23RD DECEMBER, 1947**

Relationship, as it exists now, is one series of conflicts, giving in at one time and getting upset at another time and so on. It is a constant battle between yourself and your wife, between yourself and society, a constant friction, maladjustment, struggle and contradiction between two people.

We are not discussing what should be the ideal form of relationship. The ideal is a real curse because it really prevents you from understanding what is; if you accept and work towards an idea, you merely conform, without understanding the significance of relationship; you do not understand what your relationship actually is and what it means. Are you at all "related", you and your wife, or your neighbour and yourself? Though you live together and have children though you wrangle and fight, is there any "relationship" between you and your wife? If you examine yourself, you will see that your whole intention, your whole pursuit, is an isolating process. Each one is isolating himself or herself, in possession, in name, in power, in money; each one builds a wall around oneself and says "I am related". We look over the enclosing walls occasionally when it is suitable and convenient; but, most of the time, we lurk behind the walls. This process of isolation is considered "relationship"!

In daily life, we are isolating ourselves by our activities; we are separating ourselves through function - the bank clerk and the manager, the labourer and the executive, the priest and the bishop, the man in the street and the rich man, the ignorant and the learned,

and so on. We are constantly erecting enclosing walls around ourselves, and yet we try to be "related". When there is this constant erection of walls and isolation, conflict is inevitable. The more one is enclosing, the more the struggle and the violence.

Is this isolation by the erection of the enclosing wall a natural process like the fall of an apple from the tree, or is it the result of influence by society? You are now aware that you are building the wall. Having built and being caught in the process of building the wall, your intelligence says that you should be rid of this wall. To get rid of this wall, you must first find out why you are building the wall. If you understand the truth of this, you do not have to 'struggle not to build' and you will never build the wall again. Is this isolation a form of self-protection? Is self-protection natural? Obviously it is. If you do not protect yourself in regard to food, clothing and shelter, there may be no existence at all. Physically and biologically, there must be self-protection against rain, against sunshine, etc. But, when that self-protection becomes a psychological necessity, then it becomes exploitation and all the rest of it.

When your neighbour and yourself are each behind his own wall, how can you understand each other? Why do you erect these separating walls psychologically? How will you get rid of these walls?

First of all, you are aware that you are building walls, psychologically, around yourself. Then, you enquire if such building is natural, instinctive and therefore inevitable. You do not protect yourself psychologically to be safe outwardly - name, property, bank account, etc.- but in order to be safe inwardly, in

order to give you an assurance of self-protection inside.

Some protection of you outwardly, in the form of food, clothing and shelter, is necessary; but you increase the protection of yourself outwardly in things in order to be secure inwardly. Because you are inwardly incapable of protecting yourself and therefore inwardly uncertain, you depend on outward things. You can only protect yourself inwardly with ideas, values which the mind gives with regard to things made by the hand or made by the mind. Also, you can only protect yourself in relation to an outside object. You have no inward actions or perceptions which are apart from outward things and which would render outward things as of no significance. There is no inward protection by itself.

What is the nature of the enclosing wall around you, which gives you psychological protection in relation to your neighbour, your wife and your society? The wall you build around yourself psychologically consists of the values you give to things made either by the hand or by the mind, i.e. of your ideation. These values are merely the outcome of the pleasure or the pain felt by you through your senses, i.e. the outcome of sensory values. They have no substance behind them except the significance or value you give them. In protecting yourself outwardly, you say you can use the outward things to protect you inwardly. You can use property as a means of psychological protection. Property in itself is just a piece of land which can give you food; you give that property a significance which it has not, and with that significance you protect yourself.

So, the trouble does not lie in outward things which are all made by the hand or by the mind. The trouble is because you use those

things as a means of self-protection; and therefore, you give to them values which they do not possess and, with those values, you are inwardly protecting yourself. The fact is that those values in themselves are non-existent but are merely created by your mind. Therefore, the outward things made by the hand and the beliefs made by the mind become extraordinarily important and you cling to them both because, with the values you give them, you protect yourself psychologically. What an extraordinary transformation you have made in yourself! Things made by the mind are illusory because they, beliefs, can project themselves into visions and experiences - you believe or you like to believe in the Master, and you can experience the Master. It is very simple; you want to see a vision and you see a vision, pleasant or unpleasant. It is all the projection of the mind.

So, you have discovered from this process that, through sensory perceptions, you are protecting something which is not sensory, something which you do not know.

What are you protecting behind your enclosing wall? Protecting implies that there is something which can be protected. In other words, what is that something which you are trying to protect by your values with regard to things made by the hand or by the mind? Is there anything behind the wall? You are building and erection of valuations; what is behind that wall of valuations?

To enquire if there is anything behind the wall, what is the instrument with which you are enquiring? The instrument is the outcome of the things made by the hand or by the mind, which is the wall. To find out what is behind the wall, you have to climb over the wall or go through the wall.

What are you protecting with extraordinary care everyday, struggling, cheating ruthlessly, brutally, violently, deceitfully and cunningly? When you say you are protecting your- self, you are merely protecting the wall which you have built up. So your consideration is how to strengthen the wall and not to protect something. To find out what is behind the wall, the wall must cease. You do not know what is behind the wall and therefore you are not protecting the thing behind the wall, but only the wall which you know, which is your valuation. The positive value is the wall; you do not like that and you would like to be something else.

When you are talking about protecting you do not know what you are protecting. But, you do know that the wall exists. So, perhaps you are protecting the wall, because the value is the wall, either positive value or negative value. So, you are keeping a wall, positively or negatively, as a means of protecting; and on enquiring what you are protecting, you do not know. You see the wall only and not the something behind it. Perhaps if you know what is inside the enclosure, it may not be necessary to protect at all; or perhaps there is nothing to protect.

Without knowing what is behind the wall, it is absurd your protecting or building a wall. you only know the wall. You do not know anything about protection. Therefore, the word 'protection' has gone out of your thought, and all that remains is the wall, not the idea to protect something. You are not using the word 'protection' any more because 'to protect' means 'to protect something'; and as you do not know that something you are not going to protect. All that you are now left with is the wall and not 'protection'. But the wall is made of the valuation by the valuer. So,

the wall is the valuer and the valuation.

You are protecting something which you do not know. If you know what you are protecting, that may not need any protection,. So it is a foolish action that you are doing. Therefore, you will neither protect nor destroy; and you are only left with the wall and not with the idea of protection. The wall was created out of things made by the mind; therefore, the mind is the wall. The wall is made out of the mind's tricks and valuations. As the mind is the creator of the values, the values are the mind.

What is 'me'? 'Me' is the product of desire in relation to the object of desire. A challenge and the response to the challenge constitute an experience. When the response is conditioned, the experience leaves a residue which is memory. 'Me' is 'memories', the accumulated residue of experiences, with which evaluation is made, the sum total of the qualities. So, the 'me' which is protecting the wall, is the wall, i.e. the qualifier evaluating things is the wall. Therefore, the wall is the 'me', the thinker, the thought, the valuation.

The 'me', the accumulated residue of experience, is pleasurable in part and painful. The thinker wants to avoid the painful; he finds the thoughts can be changed. So, hoping to be permanent and unchanging, he separates himself from the thoughts and talks of "I change my thoughts", thus playing a trick on himself, because the separation is not real but only fictitious. When attacked, the thinker tries to seek identification with "higher self", and when that is attacked, he identifies himself with Atman, with Paramatman, then with



## **MADRAS 29TH GROUP DISCUSSION 25TH DECEMBER, 1947**

We have been discussing the practical ways of dealing with some of the topics which we had considered already. We tried to analyse what we mean by practical steps. Is it a matter of practice, or a matter of understanding? If you understand something, there is no need for practice. If you understand and study the nature and the implications of nationalism, not bringing your prejudice and your defence mechanism against it, that very understanding would dissolve the poison of nationalism.

We also discussed the practical steps with regard to our relationship with property - not only land but name, title, degrees, alphabetical letters before and after one's name - and how property becomes of enormous significance, when inwardly, psychologically, there is poverty of being.

Then we discussed relationship with persons - between you and me, you and your wife or husband - whether you are 'related' or whether merely 'relationship' is a term without much significance. We started with the examination of "relationship" as it is now and not of what it should be. We found that relationship is conflict though that conflict is neither necessary nor inevitable. We also found that this conflict in relationship was due to each one striving for isolation; though you may live with your wife, with your neighbour and with the society, you are really building psychological walls of isolation between yourself and society, between yourself and your family. Though you say you are "related" to your wife and your children what is actually taking

place in "relationship" is that you are seeking self-protection by building up walls of resistance, and so is your wife and others. You occasionally look over the walls and call it relationship; but, the isolating walls keep you separate. Is the building of the wall an inevitable law like gravitation? You build the wall to protect yourself, On enquiry, you found that though, physically and biologically, some property - food, clothes and shelter - is essential for your existence, it is not necessary to protect yourself psychologically. Yet you are protecting yourself inwardly by the values which you have given to the things made by the hand (property) or by the mind (beliefs), thus using for your psychological protection only values based on sensory perception. Because of this, things assume an importance or significance which they do not inherently possess, and you, therefore, cling tenaciously to property and belief, even to the extent of dying for them, if necessary. The walls which you protect yourself with are built up of the value which you yourself have given to things.

Are you aware that you are creating this wall of detachment around you? You have a certain attitude and I may or may not have that attitude; the very attitude of the teacher and the disciple builds a wall. Similarly, a man of property, a man of possession, or a man of greed, creates a barrier between himself and his servant, between himself and the man who has no title; the man who has title, talks about brotherhood and about avoiding distinctions and so on; yet, he creates a barrier between himself and others. The building of these psychological walls is the very impediment to relationship and is one of the fundamental disintegrating factors in society. One of these isolating walls around you is caste. Your

father or his forbears created caste to separate themselves from the rest; probably, biologically, they thought they were superior and did not want to mix up with the rest. We can understand this tendency, because each one of us wants to feel superior. You put degrees after your name to show that you are different from another. You have the desire to be separate, to be superior to others, to be something in words and in name; that is why you are attached to your titles, your property, your name, etc. If all these are taken away from you, you are absolutely nothing. Similarly, your national prejudice is another such wall. As you are inwardly poor, shallow and empty, you seek gratification through things by giving them your own extraordinary values and you therefore cling to them with great tenacity; you therefore build the wall around you and within the enclosure you admit none, not even your son, your neighbour, or the society. In understanding this, you understand that the search for sensory gratification is the cause of creating the enclosing wall.

Desire is the builder of the wall - desire for title, for bank account, for property, for family, for beliefs. The 'I' is the product of the desire in relation to an object. How does desire come into being? Perception, contact, sensation and desire. There is a car, then perception of it, then contact with it, then a sensation caused by it, and then the desire which says "How lovely it is! I would like to have it", comes. Desire or craving comes through seeing, touching and feeling. It is the outcome of sensate values, the identification through the senses with the object of the senses. Desire with regard to ideas also follows the same process. You like or you do not like a particular idea. When you like an idea, that

idea is pleasing and gratifying to you. The acceptance of an idea or the rejection of an idea is based merely on gratification which is sensate. So, the sensory values dominate and the sensory value is the 'me' dominating the whole - 'I and my property', 'I and my relationship', or 'I and my belief'. Belief is the outcome of the projection of the mind, whether it is the belief in the ultimate Paramatman or Brahman, or in the Higher Self and the Lower Self. When you think about the Atman, it is still thought. The Brahman is still thought. As your belief in Reality, God, Atman, etc. is self-projected, it is sensory. Therefore, 'your God' is also sensate; 'your God' is created by you. The implications are tremendous if you admit this; it will mean, as far as you are concerned, the whole collapse of the so-called religious society.

So, you see that desire is the outcome of the sensate value; 'me' is the result of desire; 'me' creates, formulates, and fabricates values etc.; the wall that 'me' builds is also of sensate values created by the builder and that whatever the thinker, the actor, the builder, does is always sensory and, therefore, transitory.

You now understand how, because your values with regard to property, to relationship and to ideation are all sensory, there is conflict within yourself and chaos in the society around you which is an expression of your inner conflict. You see that your neighbour is like you in many ways and both of you have only sensate values, though you may talk of the Absolute, the Supreme, the Ideal, etc. The result is conflict between you and your neighbour which is society. That is the building of the walls that separate you and your neighbour, your sensory values and your neighbour's sensory values. So, there is no relationship between you and your

neighbour; and therefore there is no relationship between you and society. The society is not responsible for you, It passes laws but you are out of it. You fit in when it suits you; and when it does not suit you, you are out of it. Similarly, society uses you as a part of itself when it suits it; it absorbs you as a soldier when there is a war, and thrusts you into it, and you accept it. Thus, there is mutual exploitation.

You know now how conflict arises by your building your wall of sensate values. You also know that the builder of the wall is the 'I' which is itself the outcome of desire. As long as the 'I' is satisfied with the wall, there is nothing and the 'I' feels absolutely safe inside the wall. Most of you are in this state and you crave to remain undisturbed, each behind his own wall. Therefore, in your present state of psychological enclosure behind the wall of your sensate values, your talk of brotherhood has no meaning whatsoever.

Your cravings, your desires, inevitably cause you suffering. When you suffer, you feel disturbed. There is a breach in the wall, there is an enquiry, there is a storm. When you suffer, you try to forget and to avoid that very suffering by building another wall, a wall of belief, or the religious book or the temple, or the Master or some other means of escape. What happens when the 'thinker' is avoiding pain? The 'thinker' does not want to feel pain or to be disturbed. He hopes to be the permanent and enduring entity behind the wall; and, therefore, he separates himself from the wall, i.e. from the thought, i.e. from the desire. He then attempts to change his desires and his thoughts; he desires a house, he desires a quality, and ultimately he desires God. Objects of desire can be

changed and the thinker is behind the wall feeling he is always permanent. The 'thinker' and the 'thought' are now two different things because the 'me', i.e. the thinker, is the permanent entity, the other is impermanent; the 'me' is secure, the other is insecure; and the 'me' can play with the secure as much as it likes. If the thinker identifies himself with the 'thought', then, in changing the thought, he becomes impermanent - which he does not like. Therefore, the 'thought' is considered as separate from the 'I'; when the 'I' is attacked a little more, the 'I' divides itself into the higher and lower; and when the higher is attacked, the 'I' retreats further high, and becomes the Paramatman. There is always in the 'thinker' a sense of permanency, a sense of continuity.

This is what is happening in daily life. When your property is taken away, you retreat to some other permanency, to relationship; and when that goes, you turn to something else, a little higher; and so on, you always remaining, and the objects being higher and higher - which is your relationship to God or 'I am God'. The discussion which we have had so far, has revealed to you the process of your thinking so that, without deception, you can see what you think and how you act in relation to property, in relation to your wife and in relation to society. All these three are sought by you in order to safeguard yourself. Because you think you are separate from your thoughts and desires, you are all the time seeking permanency by changing your thoughts and your desires through legislation, through practices, through discipline, through systems and so on. But as has been stated already, whatever you 'the thinker' may do, it is always sensory and therefore impermanent.

You now realise that neither legislation nor belief nor discipline will alter the 'me'. According to environmental influences the 'me' can change the thought, can become a communist when it suits 'me', or a capitalist, or a socialist, or a religious person. Thus, unless the 'me' who is the mischief-maker is tackled and transformed, the 'me' will always create havoc in relationship with property, with family, and with ideas. The transformation of the 'thinker' will be radical, and not merely superficial, only when the separation of the thinker from the thought ceases.

You suggest that the thinker and the thought are now separate and they should be brought together. This suggestion is wrong because it is based on a non-reality. The 'I' is not actually separate from the thought. It was a clever trick on the part of the 'I' to separate from the thought which is impermanent, assuming its own permanency. This is fictitious. The moment the 'I' realises that it has played the trick on itself, the trick is gone and the thinker is the thought.

To sum up, the 'I' is made up of many memories. The memories are the result of desire; the desire is the result of perception, contact, sensation, identification, which is the 'me'. So, the 'I' which is the product of desire, cleverly separates himself from the desire and does something about it, because, he can always change desires, and yet he can remain permanent. That is a clever trick that he is playing upon himself with a view to entrenching himself in continuity. This is the cause of the inner conflict in each individual and of the chaos which exists in the world at present; this state of affairs will continue till the trick is gone. The 'I' does not see the falseness of the trick which he has played upon himself, because

when he realises the falseness of the trick, he will come into conflict with everybody.

Most of you agree with what we have discussed so far in regard to the falseness of the trick played by the mind on itself; yet you have not seen the real depth of this problem and, therefore, it has not brought about clarification and transformation in you. You accept this in your superficial consciousness but the deeper layers of consciousness are putting up a tremendous inward resistance to this acceptance. Is this because you are isolated or sleepy? You are not isolated and sleepy but very awake with regard to things that matter - money, passion, enjoyment and so on. You have deliberately become sleepy to things which are disturbing to you, or which you do not want. This means that you are awake in one part to things you like and asleep in another part to things you do not like. All the present conflict is the result of this partial awakening. Because one part of you is isolated and the other part is active, there is chaos created in yourself and this chaos is projected outside. This is the major portion of your existence. Nothing distracts you from the pursuit of pleasure; but whenever you apprehend any shock or suffering you promptly try your best deliberately to shut it off from you and to avoid it. That is why you do not look at this problem seriously though you verbally agree. Who is going to make you look? Can legislation, government, education, the ideal or any other outside agency make you look? Therefore, suffering comes to you as a warning. But every time you have suffering and sorrow, you look on it as a disturbance and try to avoid it so as to continue in the same old state; this sort of action on the part of the mind has made your life one series of



conflicts to avoid "what is". To be aware of how the mind is playing the trick upon itself, is the beginning of understanding. The moment you are aware of it, you invite trouble - and there is joy.

## **MADRAS 30TH GROUP DISCUSSION 27TH DECEMBER, 1947**

These discussions are really meant to be a means of self-knowledge, to discover ourselves as we are talking - not afterwards but as we go along step by step -and to experience directly what is being said, so that we could relate what we are talking to our daily life.

We were discussing the idea of separating ourselves in our relationship, how we are building walls of isolation and thinking we are "related" to each other; how the sensate values become predominant when money, property, things are used as a means of isolation; how in relationship between you and another - which relationship creates the society - there is conflict ; that this constant battle between you and me and between you and society is due to our merely looking at each other over the walls of isolation, which we have deliberately built in order to isolate ourselves as much as we can; that this isolation is a form of self-protection, and that these walls are built by the 'me', the thinker who is not really different from the thought, though we have taken it for granted that thought is separate and that the thinker remains aloof and transforms thought.

We also discussed why we do not see the depth of such a serious problem as the thinker and the thought are one, whether it is because we are asleep, or because we don't want to go deeply into the matter, as, if we do it will mean a revolution in thinking and therefore in action. If the thinker and the thought are one, the thinker has to alter himself fundamentally, and not merely the

frame of his picture which is thinking. So, the thinker plays an insidious and clever trick on himself and separates himself from the thought and then does something about thought.

To discuss this, you must find out what desire is and how desire or craving arises. Desire comes through perception, contact, sensation and identification. So there is the 'me', the person who chooses. The 'me', the thinker, is born out of desire, and he does not exist previous to desire. In your everyday experience, the thinker is separate from the thought, i.e. the thought is outside you as it were, and you can do something about it, you can modify it and recondition it. Is the thinker really separate from the thought?

How does the 'thinker' come into being? You are the result of your father and mother. How did you begin to think and feel as a child? You wanted milk, there was a sensation of hunger; then the contact with the bottle or the breast, and the struggle to feed, to grow, and then the toy, the impingement of society on the mind, and gradually, the 'I' comes out. Therefore, it is perception, sensation, contact and the desire from which is 'my mother,' 'my toy,' which grows to 'my bank account', 'my house', and so on. So the thinker, the 'me' comes through perception, contact, sensation and desire from which arises consciousness; the thinker then separates himself, for his own further security, as the high and the low, the high becoming the Paramatman and the low becoming this existence. When this existence is threatened, the thinker can always retire into the more permanent.

You are the sum total of all the human existence. As you are a Hindu, you are the result of all Hindus; you are the result of your father, not only biologically, but in thought, in your beliefs, and so

on. The 'I' comes into being through desire; then the 'I' feels established and creates the desire which is outward, the desire and 'I' thus becoming two separate entities, which means that the thinker and the thought are separate. Craving continuity, the thinker separates himself from the thought, and thinks that thought is changeable, modifiable, can be destroyed and replaced. If the thinker is the thought, then the thinker also can be changed, which means he has to admit his impermanency - which he does not like. All our actions in society are based on the idea that the 'I' is the permanent and the thought is the impermanent. We know very well the impermanency of matter. Property can be taken away from you when Communism comes, or when you lose it by speculation. Because thought is seeking permanency, it says "I will go to a higher level of consciousness or a deep level which is my belief, which is my God", and goes higher and higher to be more and more permanent. When this trick is understood, it is gone, and the thinker and the thought are one. Then, there will be a revolution in our daily life.

You admit that the thinker and the thought are one and yet there is no change in your way of living. Why? Either you are asleep which means you don't want to be disturbed, or there is an inward resistance. Now, how can we dissolve the resistance? Not by overcoming it, not by disciplining it away, but by understanding it. The moment you understand it, it drops away. What do you mean by resistance? You accept the idea on the superficial layer of your consciousness and the rest of your consciousness is resisting it. You are resisting any change. That is, you are resisting the acceptance of 'what is'; 'what is' is that the thinker and the thought

are one. You superficially say "Yes", but the rest of your consciousness is resisting it, because the unconscious sees the tremendous implications in the acceptance of 'what is'. You are afraid to lose yourself - yourself meaning your property, your status now, your belief and your son. So you are resisting in order not to lose what you are protecting, in order to guard it. This means you are resisting the destruction of ideas, relationship and things made by the hand or by the mind; you are resisting the dissolution of the identification with things, with name, with property, and so on. The house, the property, is the value which the mind gives; otherwise the house has no meaning; and things made by the mind are also the values given by the mind. You are afraid that, by not identifying with the valuations of the mind, there will be an end; and so, you are resisting their end or destruction.

You are defending the valuations which you have created, lest they should be destroyed; the valuations are created through desires, which is the mind. So, you are resisting the destruction of valuations which have come into being through thought, the thought being the result of the desire - i.e. the desire creates the thinker, the thinker evaluates and then offers resistance to the destruction of those things which he has built up. So the thinker is resisting 'what is' and the impingement of new desires. The values are created by the mind whether of things or of ideas. So, it is afraid to lose the valuation which it has created and to which it is attached. You bring a new idea and the mind does not want to have it because it is disturbing the things which it has already built.

The thinker is resisting, not with things but with ideas which are transitory in themselves. So, your resistance is transitory. You are

resisting the dissolution of valuations which are thoughts and thought is transitory. Things have no significance except what the mind gives; in their very nature they are transitory; and yet the mind clings to them and to the significance it gives them. In other words, the thinker creates evaluations and then, in examining them, finds that these evaluations are transitory, and that he is resisting the destruction of the transitory because he is seeking permanency in them. In other words, you recognise that they are all impermanent and yet you are seeking permanency in them because, by your valuation, you have given them permanency. When you recognise the absurdity of giving permanency to things which have no permanency, it drops away - just as when you know that all the banks are bad, you don't go to any bank. All things made by the hand or by the mind are in their very nature transitory because the mind alone gives values to them, transitory for the simple reason that thought is transitory and thought is the thinker. Now, you, the thinker, are asking, "Is there permanency?" because it is what you want. You are the result of desire which is impermanent. The impermanent is asking to find out the truth of permanency. The mind which has been seeking permanency has vested permanency in things made by the hand or by the mind, and it finds that they are impermanent; and yet it says it must have permanency.

Can the impermanent find the permanent? If I am blind can I see the light? If I am ignorant can I know enlightenment? There can only be enlightenment when ignorance ceases. The transitory cannot find the permanent; it must cease for the permanent to be. The person who is seeking permanency is obviously impermanent; you cannot say he is permanent. He is the outcome of transitory

desire and therefore, in himself, he is transitory - which he does not acknowledge.

Property is impermanent. Relationship is impermanent. Belief is impermanent. Therefore, seeing everything around as impermanent and as transitory, the mind says that there must be something permanent, though there is no inherent permanency. Your permanency is born out of impermanency and is therefore the opposite of impermanency; therefore it has the seed of its opposite which is transitory. When you treat impermanency as impermanent then there is nothing; but when you are seeking permanency as an opposite to transitory, the permanency itself is transitory. So you are resisting the acknowledgment of the fact that whatever you do, think and feel is impermanent, though you know very well that they are impermanent. This is another trick of the mind. So, you recognise the trick that the mind is seeking permanency in opposition to the transitory - namely that whatever you do is impermanent; and yet you are seeking permanency. Being transitory yourself, you can never find permanency, because you will evaluate "permanency" and all your valuations are transitory. the impermanent can never find the permanent.

When you realise this, you do not seek permanency through things, through relationship and through ideas. Therefore, there is no valuation and you accept them at their level. Therefore you have no conflict with them. There is a great relief if the mind is not giving values of permanency to things which have no permanency. If you say property, family and things are necessary but not as a means for permanency, then there is no conflict. It does not matter who owns the house; you use it merely as a means of protection,

not as a means of self-expansion through the search for permanency. Therefore the mind, the 'thinker' as the 'evaluator', is non-existent. When the thinker ceases to create value, perhaps something else will come into being. But, as long as the thinker exists there must be the evaluation. His values are impermanent. Therefore, if the thinker is seeking permanency, he must cease, because he is the mischief-maker and is reducing to chaos the relationship with society and with property. So your problem then is how the thinker can come to an end, how the thinking process can end.

Someone says that there will be no progress at all if the thinker ceases to exist. The word "progress" was first introduced by the industrialists in the eighteenth century in England because they wanted to make the people buy more. Progress means time. Through time, do you understand anything? You can only understand now, not tomorrow. Therefore, understanding is independent of time. So, how is the thinker to come to an end? If he does, life becomes extraordinarily marvellous and there is no conflict with things. As the thinker is the result of desire, this means that desires must come to an end. Can desire come to an end? What do you mean by desire? Perception, contact, sensation and desire. "I must have " food, "I must have" clothes, "I must have" shelter. Those are imperative 'musts'; though there are certain desires involved in them, they are necessary. But the desire or the craving for things, for family, for name, for beliefs must cease. If it ceases, what will happen to my relationship? Desire is the very expression of attachment. When I use my wife as a means of psychological necessity, then there is attachment; when she



helps me to cover up my loneliness, then I am attached. Then, she is mine. Similarly, belief becomes necessary when I am attached to it, whether it is belief in religion, or belief in an economic system. So desire can come to an end only when there is no attachment. And can I live in the world without attachment? Obviously I can. The moment I am attached it is an indication of desire - desire which is impermanent and which creates the thinker who evaluates. It is only when it ends, that you can find out if there is permanency or not. Without that, any talk of belief is puerile. I have shown you how to stop thinking. If thinking ceases, then there would be a great quickening, and a revolution would take place inside you.

## **MADRAS 31ST GROUP DISCUSSION 30TH DECEMBER, 1947**

To love one another is one of the most difficult things, because there is in it always the shadow of pleasure and pain. In it there is always the sensual memory with its incessant gnawing either of yesterday's picture or of tomorrow's delight. There is always a sense of frustration, a sense of unpleasant existence; there is never a moment of complete love, of complete communion with another. Have you ever felt this sense of an extraordinary physical resistance as well as psychological impediment in loving another, when there is really no openness between two people? Surely, there can be only love when there is this sense of complete communion with another.

There is no way to love. You cannot buy it, nor can you barter it away for something else; love must be really felt and lived, and it comes into being when this pleasure and pain, when this sense of frustration, when this sense of demanding fulfilment in another, when this sense of the "me" and "my pleasures" ceases; and that is one of the most difficult and arduous things. We can be sentimental over love; but that is not love. In loving one, you will love the whole of humanity. The idea of loving everybody has very little meaning if you don't know how to love one, your child, your husband, your wife, your neighbour. After all, the one is the whole.

The idea of cosmic love and loving mankind is really a rationalisation of the lack of love in one's heart for another. It is an easy escape of the reformer, of the humanist, of the moralist and of the righteous. Our trouble is that we really do not know how to

love one another.

We know when we love somebody with all our being. It is surely a shattering experience because it implies a letting down of all barriers.

It is worthwhile discussing the problem of duality, in which is implied pleasure and pain, resistance and non-resistance, merit and demerit, the desire for fulfilment, the desire to have an example or an ideal, the desire to imitate, the problem of resistance, meditation etc. Is there the opposite? Are we aware of the opposites and when?

When you crave for something, there is always resistance. In gaining it, you must resist other encroachments and other influences. You must build around you a wall in order to gain what you want. Others also may want the same thing: and so, you must resist them. So, in craving for something, there must be resistance.

You desire power. In setting out to achieve power, you desire to acquire position, prestige and all the implications of power. In this craving for achievement, there is inherently the state of 'not-achieving' and fear of 'not achieving'; this means resistance. Thus, every craving for something creates its own opposite, its own resistance.

Let us take attachment and detachment. Being attached, you find pain and strife in attachment; and in order to overcome that pain and strife, you say 'I must be detached.' It is really the pain that comes out of attachment that you want to get rid of; only, you call it detachment. But you never question why you are attached. If you understood what attachment is, then you would not proceed to detachment. Attachment may be the outcome of frustration. You

are attached to your house, name, wife. Inwardly, you are frustrated, you are not fulfilling, you are not complete. Therefore, the house, the family and the name become all important, to which you become attached; and when they cause you pain, you wish to 'develop detachment'. But still, the inward frustration, emptiness, poverty, continues. We treat detachment and attachment as opposites, because we do not really understand the process of detachment.

You have to understand what is implied in being held to something. In the very desire to achieve anything, there is the seed of its own opposite. In the process of 'becoming', achieving, gaining, there is always the 'conflict of the opposites', because the very desire to 'become something' creates its own opposite.

In 'becoming' there is always the dual; in 'being' there is no duality. When you are angry, there is no duality at the moment of anger, i.e. you are in the state of 'being angry'. But that 'being angry' creates a disturbance and you don't want to be angry; so you want to 'become peaceful'; this 'becoming' implies the dual. There is no duality in that particular moment when the feeling arises; duality is only found after that feeling has been termed; there is the time-factor involved in it. If there is no 'becoming', there is no duality with all its conflict, the time-factor, the whole sense of frustration and all the rest of it.

For example, you are angry; you find anger painful, you think there will be pleasure in 'non-anger'; thus you have immediately created duality; you refuse to understand the full significance of anger, but you pursue its opposite; you want to transform 'anger' into 'non-anger'. Thus, 'becoming' implies a refusal to acknowledge

'what is' and a desire to transform 'what is' into other than 'what is'.

The pursuit of an ideal also implies the 'conflict of opposites'. The ideal is something which you are not. You are this and you want to 'become' that which is your ideal. To understand the implications of what you actually are now, your mind must be free and concentrated; but if your mind is thinking in terms of the ideal, then it is distracted by the ideal. What are the implications of 'becoming the ideal'? The ideal is the example to be followed, and 'becoming' the ideal means imitation. Supposing you are arrogant, your ideal is humility. The ideal is created by your not understanding 'arrogance' which is the 'what is'. Humility is the example which you are going to become. The example means imitation. So, in becoming, in achieving the ideal, there is coping which means only imitation and no thinking. when you have an ideal there cannot be thinking; there is merely the achievement of 'becoming that ideal'. In your daily life, you are full of ideals; which means you are not thinking but merely imitating. In 'becoming', there is imitation, copying and therefore the cessation of thinking, feeling, living; and therefore, the idealists are the most thoughtless, brutal and ruthless people; and to them systems are more important than man. Hitler was said to be a great idealist. In yourself, you can see the truth of this when you pursue an ideal. You have the ideal of Brahmacharya; then you just leave you wife and go. When you have an ideal of a perfect state, the proletariat or the right, you see how ruthless you are bound to be in achieving that ideal. The ideal, for example, is the authority, whether it is imposed by another or by yourself inwardly, therefore, there is cessation of thinking and there is fear.

All your social structure, all your education, and all your relationship are based on imitation. Your judgement and your thought is based on avoiding 'what is'. Look at what is happening in society. corruption, degradation and so on. Why do you not tackle all this directly, instead of saying that through an ideal you must become marvellous?

It is the thoughtless man who is asleep and who is imitative, that wants an ideal, because he has to whip himself up to become something. But the man who is learning, watching and feeling things, does not require an ideal; he is active where he is. So, in 'becoming' there is the denial of 'what is', the denial of what you are, i.e. your 'being arrogant'. And in 'becoming humble', which is the ideal, you must find out how to become that. "How" is the imitative process. You go to a Guru for help, in which there is implied authority and fear. So, 'becoming' implies imitation and therefore no creativeness at all. Look at the society, look at us, how thoughtless as are! We are marvellous in passing examinations and nothing else. A man who is 'becoming' can never find Reality because he is not understanding 'what is', but wants to transform 'what is'. Why should any man 'become the ideal' when he is what he is? By understanding 'what is', perhaps a new thing will come into being.

So, an ideal is really an impediment; the example is a horror to a creative man. When you want to write a poem and when you are imitating Keats, you cease to be a poet. But when you are really creative and you really want to write a poem, you don't care two pins about Keats as the ideal. That is why you need revolution of a fundamental, deep and psychological nature to free you from

imitation, from the ideal; because it is only when you are free, you can be creative. When you are aware of the implications of 'becoming' which creates the ideal and which creates the example, it drops away. This means facing 'what is' and living very dangerously, sailing in uncharted seas and being very alert and awake all the time.

You say that others will exploit you. If you are intelligent, you are not exploited by others, nor do you want to exploit others. You cannot be exploited by another unless you both belong to the same club.

There is, at present, chaos in most of the countries and a revolution is taking place - economic, social as well as religious. This revolution is thoughtless and mostly chaotic. Why not acknowledge this? At least those people who are intelligent can really think it all out and deliberately bring about the necessary revolution and thus lay the foundations for a new culture. A house that is crumbling must be pulled down before you build; in the process of pulling down, it looks rather chaotic and people who look at it from outside may say that it is chaotic; but, the man who is pulling it down is not affected by it, because he knows what he is going to build.

If you are concerned with the ideal that humanity must be fed and therefore a system must be found to feed them, the common man will go hungry, and that is the case with the idealists, whether the extreme Leftist or the Rightist, because the system becomes very important. So, there is the obvious creation through false thinking, through ignorance, through wrong thinking, that the opposite, the 'becoming', is going to alter 'what is' and, on that, so

many philosophies are founded. You are not concerned in becoming humble; it is futile, it is only one of the tricks of the mind. After all arrogance is the fact. You are arrogant, what is the cause? First of all, why do you name it? Why do you term as arrogance the feeling which you have?

You give a name to a feeling that arises in you in response to a challenge, in order to bring it within the frame of reference which is memory. The feeling is new and you absorb that into the old; by giving it a name, you strengthen the old. But if you do not absorb it into the framework of references and do not give it a name, the feeling withers away. Further, the feeling is always the new, though it is out of an old conditioning; if you treat it as new, then you will understand the old.

When you are arrogant, arrogance is the effect, and not the cause; it may be the cause a little later. You feel superior and call yourself a name, because you feel a sense of inferiority and you want to become superior. The superiority is the ideal which you want to become and therefore you create the framework of imitation and therefore thoughtlessness and deny 'what is' which is your being inferior. You feel inferior in relationship to something. You want to be something because the whole society in which you live is based on 'becoming' something. And as long as you are 'becoming' you must be inferior. There is always the 'you', a little bigger than 'what is'. If you think you are nobody and if you accept that, you may not strive to 'become' somebody, because that is too silly. So, you don't "become"; you accept that you are nothing. Do you know what it means? When you accept that you are nothing, it is really wonderful. Then, you know what it means to love; then,



you are willing to cry with somebody.

The man who is something and who wants to 'become the ideal' of loving, and does not know 'what is', is merely thinking in terms of 'becoming' something. He has the ideal, the authority, the fear, the example; and he gets lost in that.

The fact is that you are nobody. Why not start from there and face facts directly without trying to become 'somebody'? To face your nothingness means to be humble and to love; it means, you have no resistance to anyone, no barrier between you and the person whom you despise and who has no ideal.

A person who is arrogant can never find humility however hard he may try to 'become' humble. A person who does not recognise his nothingness but pursues ideals is like a man who, without ever knowing how to sow, ploughs and ploughs and never sows. Behind all your knowledge, all your degrees, titles and possessions, there is nothing. When you really acknowledge that you are nothing, you are everything because you know what love is. You ask me if there is free choice in the opposite. How can there be free choice? You choose only by comparison, when you have two things; and your choice is based on either pleasure or pain. It means memory which is the accumulation of experience. So, you really are not choosing. There are two things, memory and response; and there is no choice. You may say that you have listened to the dictates of memory.

You want to know, 'how to love'. If love is the opposite of hate, ill-will, it is no longer love; love is the ideal which implies imitation; and the man who imitates, cannot know love. Man who is seeking how to love, does not know love. He may seek methods as he has the ideal of love; but he is not loving. He does not want

to acknowledge his lack of love, and he says that he has the ideal to become loving, thus deceiving himself and cheating others. "How to love" implies duality, and in the very 'becoming' there is a conflict of the opposites. If he understands the whole significance of the 'becoming' it drops away, and he is faced with 'what is'. 'What is' is the most marvellous thing; it is the only true thing: everything else is not. When he faces 'what is' - i.e. he is lacking in love - and goes deeper and deeper into it, he finds that he is nothing though he has a mask, though he is talking about God and that behind all verbal things intellectually produced there is absolutely nothing. The feeling of nothingness is not the end; it is only the beginning of liberation; your activity will be immediate and very clarifying.

You ask me how you can feel as 'nothing' when you are constantly reminded by others that you are something. You are known to be something, as a house-agent, as a black marketeer, or as a religious man worshipping God. Psychologically, you are reminded by others that you are something. You, by yourself, feel and acknowledge that you are nothing; but, society and your friends say that you are something. Either you should be 'nobody' or somebody'. If you acknowledge that you are nothing, no amount of your friends telling you that you are a great man is going to make you believe you are a great man. But when you play with them in the same market, then they will have to remind you, then you will accept them. That is, if you think that you are somewhat great, then their telling you that you are a great man means a lot to you. You want to know what will happen if you feel you are 'nothing' but you are married and have relationships. There is your

responsibility to the family; it means immediate communion because you are nothing and she want to be something. Because you are open completely and your wife is not, there is a friction between you and her, not on your part but on her part, because she is something and you are not. You love and you don't ask anything. You really love your wife or your neighbour, or your husband, because you are open. They may be closed and they may create trouble. You become more and more silent, and more and more loving. They may get more and more irritated; but you are not irritated. In other words, relationship becomes extremely difficult. The moment you are very earnest in acknowledging your nothingness, you are going to have difficulties between you and another, between you and society.

Your problem is to be that which you are. If you are stupid, cunning, black-marketing, be that. Be aware of it. That is all that matters. If you are a liar be aware that you are a liar; then you will cease to lie. To acknowledge and to live with 'what is' is the most difficult thing. Out of that, comes real Love, because that sweeps away all hypocrisy. Try it in your daily life; be what you are, whatever it is; and be aware of that. You will see an extraordinary transformation taking place immediately. And from that, there is freedom because, when you are nothing, you do not demand anything. That is liberation. Because you are nothing and you are free, there is real opening and no barrier between you and another. Though you are married and though you love one, there is no enclosure. If you love one completely, you love the whole because one is the whole.

You want to know what will happen when you feel that you are

'the whole'. Feeling as 'the whole' comes perhaps later. But first, you are nothing and you are not concerned with what comes after. If you are concerned with what is beyond the nothingness, it means you are frightened of being nothing. 'Be nothing'. Life then becomes extraordinarily simple and beautiful. Being nothing, i.e. acknowledging 'what is', is one of the most difficult tasks because mind does not like it, because it is afraid of being nothing, i.e. of having no security. But the moment you 'are nothing', you love; till then, you do not know what it means to love; till then, you have the resistance of responsibility, of duty and marrying off. If you love your wife really, you will love your children. Then you would see how they are to be taught and by whom they are to be taught. Because you love them, you want to see that they are the best human beings, not that you would compel them to any ideal. You do not realise what a revolution this will produce.

You want to know if this revolution would be reciprocated. You are not concerned with others at all. If you recognise 'what is' and live with it, you will see a revolution produced in you and therefore in the family and in the world. Surely that is the most practical way of living. Out of that comes creativeness, because when you accept 'what is' - i.e. in accepting what you are - you are free. Then you begin to create. Then there is Reality, God or what you like to call it. All ideals are foolery and without much significance for a thoughtful man. When you set all ideals aside and face 'what is' then you will find a beautiful and really indescribable love that is not yours and mine but a thing that is self-created and which is its own eternity.

# **MADRAS NOTE TO FURTHER GROUP DISCUSSIONS 1947**

[The following notes relate to the discussions which some persons had with J.Krishnamurti during afternoons, chiefly as a result of the discussions they had in the morning meetings.]

## **MADRAS 32ND GROUP DISCUSSION 17TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

My purpose in discussing various subjects with you is to awaken intelligence in you so that at least some could understand the end-purpose of life and who would devote their lives to seek Reality and keep the flame bright even in my absence.

You say that, so far, none of those who have discussed with me, has given up things like motor cars or bank balances, and that a start should be made now by giving up at least really unimportant things like the motor car, so that step by step you would be able to overcome greed. It is not 'practice' or 'progress step by step', which will lead to the cessation of greed. Mortification of the flesh will not lead to it; nor will substitution of one kind by another, nor the interpretation, in the light of past experience, of a new desire for the things of life which have not been experienced before, will lead to the cessation of greed. Greed will cease instantaneously when you have a clear understanding of its true nature.

## **MADRAS 33RD GROUP DISCUSSION 19TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

We discussed yesterday the desirability of giving up greed. So long as the mind is after the achievement of a result there is bound to be greed. There is no question of giving up of greed. When there is clear understanding the greed will cease. A mind that is concerned with explanations and conclusions will not be able to see the truth of a problem. If you begin to enquire into the cause then the mind will be led to the examination of those causes and the present state will not be understood. Instantaneous transformation will take place only when you realise and face 'what you are'.

## **MADRAS 34TH GROUP DISCUSSION 21ST NOVEMBER, 1947**

[ The discussion was mainly about greed, relationship and authority, and was practically the same as in the group-discussion-meeting held in the morning. At this meeting the full significance of relationship and authority was made clear.]



## **MADRAS 35TH GROUP DISCUSSION 24TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

[ The discussion was mainly about education. ]

The educator is himself confused and therefore the person taught by him would also be confused. The end always blinds us to the means and it would therefore be necessary to understand first the means adopted for the spread of Education. Understanding of Education is possible only through its results and the means adopted. An analysis was made of the present-day trends in Education and it was stressed that it is no use teaching anyone when the educator does not himself know the end-purpose of life.

## **MADRAS 36TH GROUP DISCUSSION 27TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

[ The subject discussed was one which had been discussed at the Morning Group Meeting but the treatment of the subject was different. ]

It is necessary to understand the true nature of Meditation. As practised by most of us, meditation is an effort to do something of which you have already an outline, thus forcing the mind along a pre-determined channel. Meditation thus becomes a process by which a pre-conceived result is achieved. This process or system involves a routine and a discipline. This, therefore, hampers freedom. Routine makes the mind mechanical and dull similar to our going to the office day in and day out, regularly on time. To discover the truth of Meditation, you have to proceed from oneself and understand the problem. You are all familiar with the effect that routine has on you. It is because most of your life is merely routine, that you are ever in search for relief through going to cinema, losing temper etc.

Again, in following a particular discipline, there is always the implication of authority.

Authority can be imposed either from outside like the Police, the Government, etc; or from inside as in the case of our beliefs or our learning through study, or our past experience. In order to find the Truth of authority we have to follow out the element of authority as it makes its appearance.

(i) by studying the behaviour of persons known to you and who have been following authority. There are the reference books on all

kinds of subjects; and if you read them, you will find that the authors who are experts on those subjects, contradict one another. Therefore, after reading all that they have said, you would feel confused.

(ii) by studying yourself under authority. If you analyse your own action you will find that you have followed some authority or other when you have found it profitable to do so. You also have rejected equally good authority when the following of such authority was found to be unprofitable. From this it is clear that you generally get interested in what profits you, and you are not willing to get at the truth of authority. Thus, seeking of profit or craving creates authority.

(iii) By analysing authority. Authority exists outside you in the form of the State with all its various departments, Public Bodies and institutions to which you belong. Inside you it resides in what you have learned or experienced in the past. In both cases - outside you as well as inside you - you accept authority only if you find it agreeable to do so; otherwise you reject the authority.

From the analysis of the above three standpoints, you arrive at the truth that craving, or desire for profit, creates authority. You can see the Truth only when you are able to see the false as false. When this is seen you are released for ever from the false. Meditation is really the thinking out of each thought fully and completely so that you see the Truth of that thought.

[ At this meeting, a distinctive effect was left by every one present in regard to the state of their consciousness. One and a half hours passed away like a few minutes when all the persons present at the meeting followed and completed each thought, without any

effort but with awareness. this was real Meditation when "Time"  
ceased and the "Timeless" came into being. ]

## **MADRAS 37TH GROUP DISCUSSION 29TH NOVEMBER, 1947**

We have already discussed about the various factors involved in meditation, and how meditation as generally practised involved belief in gurus, in tradition or in technique.

You follow a technique only when you want to imitate with a view to achieving something. It is only when you know what you want that you can discuss the technique necessary for acquiring the same. If you analyse your thoughts, you will find that you do not really know what you are seeking because at one moment you want something and at another moment another thing. Your mind is a battlefield of various thoughts and desires. Predominantly you feel some pain or some suffering from which you would like to be free. When you seek freedom from such suffering you find that you are restricted by many bondages. Without knowing the nature of those bondages and how they arose, you merely strive to be free from those bondages, which attempt always proves futile.

It is therefore necessary for you to be aware that you are bound and what you are bound by - i.e. you must understand and be aware of 'what is'. To understand 'what is' you must give your whole being to it. If you feel any effort in this, then it is an indication that your attention is divided between that understanding and some other distraction. In your daily life, almost everything is a distraction - i.e. rituals, cinemas, radios, enjoyment of the senses, etc. which is mainly due to your thinking in relation to the objects around you. Every thought which is really the result of the past is a distraction. When the mind realises that thinking itself is a dis-

traction it also realises the futility of thinking. You have only your mind at your disposal and you have been depending only on it for all your understanding; and now you realise that that too is undependable.

# MADRAS 38TH GROUP DISCUSSION 1ST DECEMBER, 1947

[ One friend asked whether meditation can be practised for acquiring power, such as clairvoyance, and therefore this subject was taken up for discussion. ]

Generally speaking, seeking power takes one or the other of the following forms:

(i) Physical: - Power over matter, such as an engine or a motor car. This requires the mastering of the concerned technique. Modern civilisation is based on power which man has acquired by scientific skill to tame nature and to utilize its resources for the benefit of man.

(ii) Over yourself: -

a) Body - By doing appropriate physical exercise you gain control over your body.

b) Emotions: You can control your emotions and also be able to exercise power over others, over your relatives, through relationship. This is how several of you dominate others through relationship.

c) Mentation. Many of you practice vigorously to exclude various thoughts that arise in your mind in quick succession in the hope that you will be able to have only that thought which you choose. Though the mind will not be creative in this manner, you get some power to arrange your ideas and express them forcefully.

d) Super-sensory. It is also possible to gain powers of a super-sensory nature, such as clairvoyance. As a matter of fact experiments have been made in America to control matter by

thought. Actually, by thought, the second-hand of a watch has been stopped from its movement. This shows that there is the possibility of controlling matter, and probably to some extent other individuals also, by means of thought.

Asceticism is really the pursuit of power through control of various kinds. Why do you seek power, or domination, over others? Generally this question is approached either a) through utilitarianism - i.e. what use it may be put to - or b) humanism - i.e. whether it will help in the salvation of the ignorant, etc. If you follow the utilitarian idea, then you will be lost in the various uses to which power is put and you will not be able to understand the truth of the problem of why you seek power. Similarly in following the idea of salvation of others, you bring in the question of morality, right and wrong, etc. Morality implies duality - right and wrong, good and bad, etc. Following this approach you will be lost in the various social and religious edicts that are considered desirable to enforce morality, and you forget all about the search for truth of the problem.

In order to ascertain the truth of the problem you should not be concerned with the uses to which power is put, nor with morality, as such concern always implies conflict of opposites.

You will then find that power is sought for itself because it is gratifying to you. You suggest that power is sought with a view to have continuance of a new desire, to seek fulfilment through things, through relationship and mentation; this indicates that you have attempted to use memory to solve this problem of power because we have previously discussed this question of continuance. As has been stated already, the application of any other idea which



we have had before like Communism, Utilitarianism, etc. - to solve our new problem of seeking power - will be a hindrance to the discovery of Truth.

If you have intense desire for the search of Truth and if you realise that your mind is conditioned, then you are free of the conditioning. It is only then that your mind is still and free from all distractions. Then you will realise that your seeking of power is essentially due to your attempt to seek fulfilment of yourself through things, relationship and mentation. You seek such fulfilment because you are empty, lonely and insufficient. When the mind realises this, it is empty of all thoughts and is quite still - i. e. there is no thinking. This is really the highest form of meditation. The mind is then fully alert and is ready for creation to take place. Then the mind will be free from 'Time', duality, etc., without any effort whatsoever. As has already been stated, any system or practice will surely be a hindrance for the mind to arrive at this state.

To sum up, in your search for Truth regarding power, you have realised that conditioning of any kind is a hindrance to discovery of Truth. You have to emphasise not the conditioning but the search. Then, in examining this, you found that the seeking of power is because of your desire for gratification and for filling up your emptiness. Therefore, you must lay the emphasis not on the seeking of power but on understanding the emptiness in you. When the mind thus emphasises the primary issue and not the secondary, and when it follows each thought connected with the primary issue to its conclusion, there is understanding of the problem.

## **MADRAS 39TH GROUP DISCUSSION 3RD DECEMBER, 1947**

[ A friend said that she very much desired to give up something which she felt was undesirable but that she could not do so. She wanted this matter to be discussed. For this purpose, another friend suggested the substitution of the thing which she wanted to give up, by something higher and impersonal. The matter was then discussed. ]

In daily life there is constant strife in the individual, which wears out his mind. The problem can be enunciated as follows: "I am gossiping; I want not to gossip; but I find it is very difficult." The substitution process will be "I am gossiping; I do not like gossiping; I want to think about something impersonal and bigger - e.g. world problem regarding food."

All religions have advocated the substitution process and also have suggested that the mind be kept fully engaged with these substitutions so that there would be no room for gossiping at all. Seeking God all the time is really having the single substitution, God, which will answer all "evil" qualities.

In seeking substitution, you follow that substitution without knowing what it is, merely because of your past memory or because of your accepting some authority; and the original problem is left untouched. Even when you have substituting, gossiping does not cease, but is repeated probably at a higher and more refined level. Your whole life is a series of substitutions as can be seen from your ceremonies, your change of religions and religious practices, your change of membership in societies, and your

seeking one guru after another, etc. You have to realise that the pursuit of substitution is false.

## **MADRAS 40TH GROUP DISCUSSION 5TH DECEMBER, 1947**

You have seen that it is necessary to realise that substitution is a false action. Why do you seek substitution?

You are gossiping and you say that you don't want to gossip and therefore you want to give up gossiping. The desire to give up gossiping is really a substitute for the gossiping which is your actual state.

A friend said that his ill-health was found to be due to smoking and he gave up smoking immediately. It was pointed out that this giving up was really based on the fear of a breakdown in his health and that even though he gave up smoking he had not really solved the problem of smoking.

A habit, however bad it may be, will be continued so long as it is pleasurable and it will be given up the moment it is found to be painful. To be free of habit, you have to understand the problem of habit.

Another friend referred to his having given up pooja recently but that the image which he had been worshipping previously, always stared him in the face. This question was gone into and it was pointed out that pooja was really done by that friend with a profit motive - i.e. with a view to gain something, and that it was based upon authority - i.e. the injunction given by some priest that pooja would lead to his gaining the object in view. His desire for change in regard to the performing of the pooja was also probably due to his having accepted another authority. Thus, there has been no understanding, and therefore the giving up of the pooja has not

led him anywhere. When there is desire for gain or profit or to achieve a particular result, there is greed. When there is greed, there is no investigation at all because there is always the fear that enquiry will affect the investment that has already been made. When mind is free of all distractions like profit and authority, and when you give over your whole being to the understanding of the pooja and all the implications involved in it, then there will be no problem.

## **MADRAS 41ST GROUP DISCUSSION 8TH DECEMBER, 1947**

[ One friend wanted to know how he could solve the various problems that arise in his daily life, and this question was discussed. ]

In actual life problems are solved by individuals in various ways.

(i) Some people solve their problems one by one as they arise. this process implies that (a) the problems are isolated and are not interrelated, (b) that the individual concerned is asleep and each problem comes and wakes him up - for example, a domestic calamity like the death of a son. When he wakes up, he does something about the problem and then goes to sleep again.

(ii) There are others who find that when they try to solve one problem, that problem is interrelated with many other problems. They get puzzled because of the arduousness of the attempt and, giving up the attempt to solve the problem, go to sleep.

(iii) In the case of others, some problems come to them while they are asleep, and wake them up; there are other problems to which they go when they are awake. In other words, they are half asleep sometimes and less asleep at other times. When such a person attempts to solve the problems, he invariably pigeon-holes them under categories and solves them in the light of what he knows already of each such type or category.

It is, therefore, necessary to understand the truth of this problem.

When you are intelligent, you are fully awake and, in that state,

you meet each problem instantaneously and therefore it is not really a problem to you at all. If you are not intelligent or awake, you meet each problem in a half sleepy state and you cannot therefore solve it. This leads to pain and sorrow. When you begin to think about this state, you realise that you are dull and asleep. Therefore in order to get the correct solution of this problem, you have first to find out why you are asleep.

The problem now is why you are dull or asleep. Are you dull by nature or have you been made dull by outside agencies? If you believe that dullness is your nature you believe that God has made you dull, as is said by every man of religion. If your dullness is due to outside agencies then you can believe that outside agencies can also make you intelligent - i.e. you can be moulded by environment, by the State. In so doing you will be believing in materialism. In order to know the truth of the matter, you should not identify yourself with either of these approaches, religion or materialism, but you should understand the true nature of the problem by following out the thought completely.

## **MADRAS 42ND GROUP DISCUSSION 10TH DECEMBER, 1947**

On the last occasion, we saw the need to understand the problem without identifying ourselves either with the religious or with the materialistic idea. You have to be free from the conflict of the opposites. In fact, the opposite does not exist at all.

You should not follow the general practice of either identifying with God or with materialism which is based solely on sensate values. In order to see the true significance of both these approaches, you have to start from the known centre, 'I'. You don't know God but you know only the 'me'. You have therefore to start from the 'me' which is really the result of your senses. Thus you have to give the senses their right place. As was stated already, greed creates the conflict of opposites. Mostly due to tradition and to the manner of your upbringing, you think in terms of opposites. There is a continual conflict of opposites inside you - right and wrong, good and evil, anger and non-anger, arrogance and humility, communism and capitalism, materialism and absolutism etc. This is because you do not know how to view things from the centre, i.e. from the 'me'. Instead of relating every problem to the end-purpose of life, you relate it to one or the other of the opposites, and therefore your life is full of frustration. If you understand this, you will be free of the conflict of opposites. This can be summed up as follows: Thesis versus Antithesis -

Communism or Materialism -- Absolutism

All sensate values -- God, the Absolute Value



Matter and man can be shaped -- Idea moves on matter by environment, by the State

Importance of the State -- Sacredness of the individual

Totalitarianism -- Individualism

The question of duality, the conflict of opposites, has already been gone into fully. As this conflict is wearing you out in your daily life, it is absolutely necessary for you to understand it and thus be free from this conflict.

The naming of a feeling - When you contact something with any of your senses you give it a name to capture it, usually adopting the convention already set up. This is done even in the case of the feelings that arise in you though the feeling cannot be contacted by the senses. Therefore the word which is 'sensuous', cannot adequately describe the feeling which is non-sensuous. The word is not the thing. However, to you the word has become important and you interpret your feeling through a word. Therefore you miss the full significance of the feeling. As this is one of the things which you are doing constantly in your daily life, it is necessary for each one of you to realise that it is futile to use words which are sensuous to capture your feelings.

## **MADRAS 43RD GROUP DISCUSSION 12TH DECEMBER, 1947**

The purpose you have in view in naming a feeling or applying a term to it, is (i) to convey that feeling to others and (ii) to place it or to pin it up and to recognize it.

When applied to objective things, the words are quite apart from the things and you don't interpret those things through the words as you can contact those things directly. In the case of feelings and thoughts, their effect on the body of the person concerned can be seen and felt by others. In order however to convey those feelings to others, the person concerned has to use the words to denote them. When a feeling arises, he names it in order to evaluate according to the frame of references already established in his memory; he thus absorbs it into himself and strengthens the memory, the 'me'. Therefore the naming of a feeling converts it to 'Time', - i.e. continuance - and leads either to the condemnation of a painful feeling or to the identification with a pleasurable feeling. If the feeling is not named, it is not absorbed, therefore it runs its course and then ceases without in any way strengthened the 'me'.

In actual life, we always name the pleasurable feelings thus giving them continuance, and we always avoid painful feelings. A man seeking God by avoiding sensate values is still pursuing sensate values, i.e. pleasure on a higher level - just like a drunkard who seeks pleasure in a crude manner and on a lower level. By avoiding painful feelings and pursuing pleasurable feelings he wreaks havoc to society and causes a great deal of harm to others. Similarly, the man who seeks pleasure only in ideation, also causes

great mischief to others.

You have to understand the implications of this and seriously experiment with yourself by not naming the feelings as they arise in you.

## **MADRAS 44TH GROUP DISCUSSION 15TH DECEMBER, 1947**

What is thinking? You realise that it is entirely a new question and your memory does not furnish any framework of reference with which you could answer this question. There is, therefore, hesitancy or silence on the part of the mind. To the challenge involved in the question, what is thinking, there is no ready response from you because the question is absolutely new. There is therefore a gap between the challenge and the corresponding response. What is the state of mind during this gap? In this state, the mind does not refer to any framework of reference but at the same time it is extremely alert though passive. Therefore, intelligence comes into being; the state of a 'new' mind facing a new challenge can be known by you, though it cannot be verbalised.

## **MADRAS 45TH GROUP DISCUSSION 17TH DECEMBER, 1947**

Let us consider the truth or the inner significance of falling in love in relation to the understanding of what thinking is in the light of our previous action.

When you fall in love with a woman, it is a new experience to you. To understand the truth of it you must think rightly. First you realise how all frameworks of references imposed upon you by society (you are old, you are poor, etc), by your relations and by your friends are all hindrances; when you understand them as such, those hindrances fall away. You are free now. When the frameworks from outside of you fall away, intelligence has begun to operate. You want, however, to be sure that it is whole intelligence and not partial intelligence. When you analyse your state carefully and deeply, you find that your mind dwells upon a past occasion when you saw your love and that your mind also looks forward with the hope of meeting her at a future date - because both of these give sensuous pleasure. All memory, personal experience, gives sensuous pleasure. So you find that while you are in love, there is 'self-forgetfulness' or complete giving over of yourself to another; and also there is a continuity of the self which seeks sensuous pleasure in the past or in the future. This means that self-forgetfulness which implies the giving away even of your life for your love, is in operation with its contradiction namely 'clinging to self'. This is really an indication of lack of intelligence.

When you think over this, you realise that society in

condemning your state is hindering you at every stage in your search for Truth; you are mis-informed and forced to adopt frameworks ever since your childhood, and none can help you to find Truth. You then realise that you are alone and you have to be alone if you seek Truth. In the history of the world every seeker after Truth has found himself alone as explained above. This has been mistaken as a need to run away from the world in order to seek God, Truth.

## **MADRAS 46TH GROUP DISCUSSION 19TH DECEMBER, 1947**

In your search to understand the inner significance of falling in love, you came to the point when you knew that you were in love and that your mind was wandering backwards and forwards - to the past and to the future - seeking pleasure in thinking of the past actions when you met the object of your love, or of the future when you would next meet her. At this stage, most of you want to get a result or condemn the sensuous pleasure which you get out of the memory of your company with your object of love. You have to understand the truth of this.

All existence is sensory. Pleasure and pain are also sensory. If you exclude any pleasure you must exclude all. If you exclude all, you will cease to live. Therefore, you realise that in life there are three important inescapable principles, Love, Pleasure and Pain of which pleasure and pain are sensory.

We have to understand the significance of pleasure and pain. We generally deny pain and pursue pleasure. Our daily life is one continual pursuing and denying. The 'I' is the result of this pursuing and denying, and it is therefore a contradiction. That which is in contradiction, cannot understand Truth. You, therefore, realise that you who are in contradiction, cannot understand the truth of these three principles. When you realise this, you are against a blank wall. At this stage, what happens to your seeking pleasure in a memory of your object of love back to the past or forward to the future?

## **MADRAS 47TH GROUP DISCUSSION 21ST DECEMBER, 1947**

[ When the question was raised of understanding pleasure involved in connection with love as discussed at the last meeting, a friend suggested that we should discuss the subject of fear. ]

Fear exists not by itself but only in relationship to something either external or inside oneself. You are always afraid of something. Fear is the result of (i) doing something which you would not like others to know or (ii) your being uncertain. Thus, fear will cease only when you face 'what is'.

Some say that fear can be got rid of by making an effort or by having the strength or the courage to overcome fear. All effort, will-power, struggle means conflict and conflict cannot lead to cessation of fear.

Why do you not face 'what is'? It is because of the tendency in you to 'become' the ideal, You don't know 'what is' and yet you don't like it, and you would like to become something else which is your ideal, which is naturally intensifying the conflict and the fear. The ideal does not exist nor is it understood. When you understand this and when you don't pursue this 'becoming', then fear ceases and you face 'what is'.

From this it is clear that your ideas about ideals and methods to achieve your ideals are all wrong and should be thrown overboard. This gives you release from a really great burden.

[ A friend suggested that he had the fear of death especially because he is getting old and that his son had not yet been employed. This problem was analysed in the light of the point



discussed above. ]

## **MADRAS 48TH GROUP DISCUSSION 24TH DECEMBER, 1947**

Whenever you meet with a challenge there is a response. The challenge and the response constitute an experience. Generally such experience leaves a residue - which is what you have learned from that experience; this is memory. When there is a similar challenge again, the response is by the already existing residue. The residue itself is old and it translates the new challenge according to itself and the result is added to the residue. Thus, the residue gets thicker and thicker. Though the accumulation is undergoing modification, it is still old in relation to any new challenge.

You are changing. So also is your neighbour. Yet when you meet your neighbour, you have your old picture of that person.

This residue is a problem only when it is pleasurable or painful. If pleasurable, you leave it as it is; if painful, you do something about it. This is how you have marvellous recollections of pleasure and horrible recollections of pain. Why do you fight pain or suffering? Is not suffering only a symptom of your avoiding to face 'what is'?

## **MADRAS 49TH GROUP DISCUSSION 26TH DECEMBER, 1947**

Suffering is the state of disturbance. Either you try to avoid it through some system or escape, or you understand its true significance.

Whenever there is a problem, it ceased to be so if there is an answer for it. It is really a problem to you only when it demands a solution and you are unable to find it. It will then be necessary for you to study it for itself.

Craving is the cause of suffering. Without understanding this, your attempt merely to get rid of suffering is bound to be futile.

Supposing you meet with a domestic calamity, like the death of your relative, you feel lonely and you suffer as you would like to retain continuously the state of peace in which you were, prior to his death, and which was agreeable to you.

Is suffering merely a state of disturbance? Is it not a warning that you should wake up and not sleep?

You feel disturbed only when you are asleep or when you hold on to something. Therefore any attempt on your part to get rid of that disturbance or suffering means that you wish to continue in a state of sleep and you feel lost because you sought fulfilment of yourself in your relative. You are seeking continuity in a state of sleep to get a permanent security to which you could attach yourself. Therefore this suffering has nothing to do with your relative's death, and you have never treated suffering as an indication to you of your being asleep.

If this is realised by you, then you will be interested only in

what you actually are - i.e. in 'what is' - and your desire to get rid of suffering would then be only a distraction.

Because suffering is a disturbance of continuity, you wish to seek ways and means of entrenching yourself in permanency or in continuity, economic, social etc. You will not be disturbed psychologically either (i) by going insane or (ii) by seeking self-protection through belief and by giving yourself over completely to that belief. As you don't want to be disturbed, you can always find some explanation or other for suffering and you seek a way of not being disturbed psychologically. You then try to shut off everything that disturbs you and to improve in all things that are pleasurable to you. You choose the field agreeable to you and any factor that prevents your choice is a disturbance to you. You therefore adopt a permanent set of choice undisturbed by other things. Naturally you choose the field which gives you satisfaction and you don't want a disturbance in that field except towards improvement. The problem is whether you can improve in the field of your choice without any disturbance, especially when you are trying to shut off the factor that makes for improvement.

Improvement can only be known in relationship. Improvement is only by comparison - i.e. by reference to the framework of values, viz., memory which is the residue of experience in relationship with others. This framework is the product of disturbances and you are attempting to use it to ward off disturbance. This attempt, therefore, leads to a perpetual state of contradiction in which there is suffering. In other words, when you attempt to avoid disturbance you don't want memory; but when you want to improve in the field of your choice you really want memory; thus there is contradiction.

If you don't want any improvement at all but only continue to shut off every disturbance, then it really means, 'sleep' equal to 'death'. You feel disturbed because you are sensitive. Therefore when you attempt to cut off anything that causes disturbance to you, it means you want to be 'insensitive' or 'dull'. If there is complete cutting off of disturbances, you will be in a sleepy state. Then, the result of all your further activities in the same direction will be either (i) to put you to sleep or (ii) to enable you to realise that cutting-off is a wrong process as it has led you to this state of insensitivity. If there is understanding, there is realisation; and your intention to continue undisturbed changes; you don't then make any attempt to cut yourself off inwardly from anything that was considered to be a disturbance previously; and every such 'disturbance' is no longer suffering because you are now awake and therefore you are able to understand 'what is'.

## **MADRAS 50TH GROUP DISCUSSION 29TH DECEMBER, 1947**

In daily life, if you watch yourself you will find that you are not sensitive. Why are you not sensitive? Because it hurts you, or because you don't want to be found out in your true colours, your natural instinct is to be physically insensitive. Generally speaking, artists are considered unsteady and immoral. That is because, biologically and physically they are intense in their emotions.

Modern civilisation necessarily involves a biological and physical barrier of sensitivity as otherwise existence will be almost impossible. Is it necessary to have also a psychological barrier? In practice, we are psychologically more sensitive than even physically, though both work upon each other. We have walls of guilt, defence and fear.

Let us find out to whom there is experience, to him who is asleep or to him who is awake. Experience is only to the man who is asleep because he is awakened by that experience and he then says that he has had experience. If he is awake, he is always active and therefore he has no experience.

You now want to know what Karma means. Karma really means either to do or to be, and it comprises (i) the instinctive responses of the physical and (ii) the cultural responses of the psychological human being. The cultural responses are educated, controlled, conditioned and disciplined. Society, by means of its discipline, impinges on the individual and changes his impulses. The individual has also inherited impulses from his past. So the present is the passage from the past to the future. His cultural and

psychological responses are from the past but modified by the conjunction of the past with the present. Thus, the past is controlling and modifying the present - i.e. the cause which was in the past brings about an effect in the present. The past modified by, or flowing through, the present produces action which is also conditioned. The old, meeting the new challenge, produces modified action - i.e. the new is always modified by the old. The past is the 'me' and in conjunction with the present, the 'me', produces action. The past itself was a series of modifications- yesterday was a modification of the day before yesterday in conjunction with yesterday's present; similarly, the day before yesterday was the modification of the day before in conjunction with the present of the day before yesterday. Today is a modification of yesterday in conjunction with today's present. Thus, the 'modifier' is the continuous entity of the days before yesterday, yesterday and today. The modifier is the actor and he is the result of modification of the innumerable days before yesterday. Therefore, he is the creator of time - the time of memory not chronological time. As the actor is the result of the past, he necessarily causes modification to the present when he meets the present which is new. This meeting of the past with the challenge of the present which is new, leads to conflict which results in modification of the new into the old. In other words, your feeling now is conditioned by what you felt yesterday and all the days before. Therefore, in meeting a new challenge today you act in a conditioned manner and therefore you feel pain.

Yesterday was modified by the days before yesterday. In the time-interval, cause and effect form a process of change. That

which was the effect yesterday of a cause of day-before-yesterday, is now found to be the cause of the effect today; this effect in turn will be the cause of something which will be noticed as effect tomorrow.

Is today (which is cause) different from tomorrow (which is effect)? Is cause different from effect? Is what we call modification a modification at all?

The means creates the end. Is the end distant from the means?

You have seen that what was the effect becomes the cause and what is the cause will become the effect, and that this is a continuous chain throughout. You have also realised that the actor who is the modifier, is also really the cause and the effect, and that there is no time-interval when the cause is distant from the effect; thus cause and effect are the same.

As has already been stated, the conditioned experience of yesterday meets the present which is always new, and modifies the present according to yesterday's conditioning. This modification is taking place continuously with no time-interval and therefore there is no moment in time when the cause and the effect are two distinct things separate and distant from each other. The whole is one continuous process and the action is a continuous stream where the cause, the effect and the modifier are all one and the same. Why is it that the actor does not realise that he is at the same time the cause, the effect and the modifier? You are sorrow (i.e. today); you are the cause of sorrow (i.e. tomorrow); yet you want to avoid sorrow. Today's experience has been conditioned by yesterday's and it will condition the experience of tomorrow. Therefore, psychological time is created by memory and does not exist except



as memory ever undergoing modification. As long as the actor is the result of yesterday in conjunction with the present, he will be the modifier also. Cause and effect and their modification are all fluid and in a state of flux, they are never steady. You are the cause and the modifier always living and moving, always going on as one continuous process. If you realise this, then to you, time as a process of understanding ceases.

If you consider that the cause is different from the effect, then you accept the time-interval for modification. that means you can modify the effect during this time-interval; this implies growth or progress in time towards a state already projected by you. This is really false because the acorn contains the oak tree and it cannot grow into anything else. When you thus realise that cause and effect are the same, there is no time at all; and when you also realise that any action on the part of the actor will be only in time, you will cease to think in terms of time. Therefore the actor cannot do anything but remain still and silent in a state of alertness. Any discipline that the actor chooses to impose upon himself is really a response to a challenge made by a temptation or a desire, whether verbal or painful. All discipline is therefore a process of isolation. For instance, to resist greed, you discipline against greed by erecting a wall of non-greed. When discipline is a means of resistance, you are using time as a means of modification or resistance and therefore time becomes important. Discipline, being then a process of conditioning in time, causes sorrow.

When you realise this and when you understand the whole meaning of discipline, the discipline drops away. You will never act contrary to what is orderly if you live without discipline but

with understanding.

Fighting a response always leads to further resistance. Your psychological inward intention is to be free so that you may meet a new challenge without any conditioning; therefore, you would allow all the responses that are already in you to come out; you do not impede them in any manner. You go on like this, till you have worked out all your old responses. This understanding of responses really leads to the dropping away of your responses and you will be neither 'excited' nor 'not excited', because being aware of every response means intense watchfulness. You will then be in a state of extraordinary pliability when love will come into being. Then, the actor who has realised himself to be the cause, the effect and the modifier, faces everything that comes to him irrespective of whether it is pleasurable or painful without any resistance whatsoever.

## **MADRAS 51ST GROUP DISCUSSION 31ST DECEMBER, 1947**

When you do not understand fully "the now" in which you are, how can you know about tomorrow? When you do not know anything about living, how can you understand death? Knowledge gathered from books or from others or from one's own experience is really an impediment to the understanding of 'what is'. You say that some knowledge of psychology is necessary to understand what we are discussing. Words are useful only so long as they are not hindrances to communication. It is really very difficult to understand how we use words and how to interpret. There is no need to learn any psychological terminology to understand what we have been discussing, especially as we have been using only ordinary words.

Knowledge and book-learning will be a help only in connection with the learning of a technique. For instance, when you study Engineering you begin to know what has been previously experimented with and, as you experiment, you learn more.

Self-knowledge is quite different from technical knowledge. Accumulation of Engineering knowledge and also knowledge about other technical subjects has gone on through centuries and you cannot do without them. But it is not the case with self-knowledge which cannot be communicated to another. For instance, you suffer not because the book says so; to find a solution for suffering you have to start anew independent of others' experience. You have to start with yourself to enquire and to find out the solution. Any amount of understanding of what others have

said about suffering will not be the same as your own understanding of your suffering or sorrow. Nowadays, people go to psycho-analysts in order to dissolve their sorrow. When you gather knowledge in regard to psychology, you are only assimilating the various systems of psycho-analysis relating to the mind. Gathering of such knowledge makes your mind conditioned; and there is also a constant choice and discarding of the knowledge given by others. Mere gathering of knowledge from books really conditions your mind because you search for security in knowledge, and you agree with what is pleasant to you; for instance, war is disastrous, everyone knows it; and yet, people are ready to go to war. You read a number of knowledge-giving books but you don't relate what you read to your action in daily life.

If you care to analyse the question seriously, you will find definitely that you can understand and face 'what is' without reading a single book. You have got your own prejudice which translates the knowledge that you gather from books; and no book can point out to you that you are prejudiced nor can it teach you how to love. You can only discover when the mind is fresh without any burden of book knowledge.

Using knowledge to further thinking really amounts to treating knowledge as memory. Thinking is the response of memory to a challenge. How can understanding which is new be the outcome of memory, of book-knowledge, which is old? The new cannot be the outcome of the old.

To understand today, your attachment to yesterday must cease, as yesterday prevents you from experiencing anew.

An incomplete experience leaves a scar or a residue whereas a

completed experience does not leave any residue. This residue is memory. Similarly suppression of any feeling leaves a residue. The problem then is how to act without leaving a residue.

Psychologically, you have to give an end to every one of your feelings. Otherwise, you carry it over and it becomes a burden. When you see the implications of continuing the feeling and the truth of ending the feeling so as to leave no residue, there is an immediate ending. Then there will be no continuity but there will be renewal. Memory continuing on and on is incapable of understanding. Therefore a mind seeking continuity can never meet the new. Therefore your mind should not be interested in accumulating; and it can meet the new only when it is not burdened with memory. Similar is the case with your thought and with your feeling.

It is necessary to experiment with this in your daily life and so live that every thought and feeling comes to an end. This means you should be extremely careful as to what you say consciously or unconsciously, what you feel and what you do. Every word has a verbal and a nervous reaction which sets a wave going. Do not allow other's words to react upon you. Be careful not to use words which produce responses in others. Be careful about what books and newspapers you read. Similarly, what you feel affects you nervously and you will find what tremendous effect cinema-going has upon you. Cinema shows awoken responses which continue in that state and are not ended. Therefore, you are inclined to go again and again to movies. You have to understand this and be free from all these excitements. Love is not memory and it comes into being only before you have a feeling. The ending of feeling is not a battle

to overcome a struggle but it is really seeing directly the truth of ending the feeling. A feeling is a thought when named. When words have nervous responses both on yourself and on the individual in relationship with you, they become important, so, you are silent. Similarly, when you end a feeling, there is immediate communion and there is complete understanding.

You should all of you live a personal life of inner awareness which is possible only through love and understanding. You will find Truth only through awareness of your own thoughts, feelings and actions. Such an awareness will free you from your shortcomings and will enable you to solve your problems without your striving to force any solution. Life will then become rich and you will find joy in every one of life's moments, and you will not be interested in any habitual or mechanical pursuits. Then, to you, Reality will come into being.

## **BOMBAY 1ST PUBLIC TALK 18TH JANUARY, 1948**

To communicate with one another, even if we know each other very well, is extremely difficult. Here we are; you do not know me, and I do not know you. We are talking at different levels. I may use words that may have to you a significance, different from mine. Understanding comes only when we, you and I, meet on the same level at the same time. That happens only when there is real affection between people, between husband and wife, between intimate friends. That is real communion. Instantaneous understanding comes when we meet on the same level at the same time.

It is very difficult, at a gathering of this kind, to commune with one another easily, effectively and with definitive action. I am using words which are simple, which are not technical, because I do not think that any technical type of expression is going to help us solve our difficult problems. So I am not going to use any technical terms, either of psychology or of science. I have not read any books on psychology or any religious books, fortunately. I would like to convey, by the very simple words which we use in our daily life, a deeper significance; but that is very difficult if you do not know how to listen.

There is an art of listening. To listen really, one should abandon or put aside all prejudices, pre-formulations and daily activities. When you are in a receptive state of mind, things can be easily understood; you are listening when your real attention is given to something. But, unfortunately, most of us listen through a screen of

resistance. We are screened with prejudices, whether religious or spiritual, psychological or scientific; or with our daily worries, desires and fears. And with these for a screen, we listen. Therefore, we listen really to our own noise, to our own sound, not to what is being said. It is extremely difficult to put aside our training, our prejudices, our inclination, our resistance, and, reaching beyond the verbal expression, to listen so that we understand instantaneously. That is going to be one of our difficulties.

I am going to explain presently that truth can be understood instantaneously. It is not a matter of time, it is not a matter of growth or of habit. Truth can only be understood directly, immediately, now, in the present, not in the future; and it can be understood, felt, realized, when there is the capability of listening directly, in an open manner and with an open heart. But if our minds are engrossed, if our hearts are tired, then there is no possibility of receiving that which is truth. So our difficulty is to have that instantaneous capacity to perceive directly for ourselves and not wait for the medium of time. Time and life become a process of destruction when we are unable to understand directly; so it is obvious why I suggest that you should listen without any resistance.

If, during this discourse, anything is said which is opposed to your way of thinking and belief, just listen, do not resist. You may be right, and I may be wrong; but by listening and considering together, we are going to find out what is the truth. Truth cannot be given to you by somebody. You have to discover it; and to discover, there must be a state of mind in which there is direct perception. There is no direct perception when there is a resistance,



a safeguard, a protection. Understanding comes through being aware of what is. To know exactly what is, the real, the actual, without interpreting it, without condemning or justifying it, is, surely, the beginning of wisdom. It is only when we begin to interpret, to translate according to our conditioning, according to our prejudice, that we miss the truth. After all, it is like research. To know what something is, what it is exactly, requires research - you cannot translate it according to your moods. Similarly, if we can look, observe, listen, be aware of what is, exactly, then the problem is solved. And that is what we are trying to do in all these discourses. I am going to point out to you what is, and not translate it according to my fancy; nor should you translate it or interpret it according to your background or training.

Is it not possible, then, to be aware of everything as it is? Starting from there, surely, there can be an understanding. To acknowledge, to be aware of, to get at that which is, puts an end to struggle. If I know that I am a liar, and it is a fact which I recognize, then the struggle is over. To acknowledge, to be aware of what one is, is already the beginning of wisdom, the beginning of understanding, which releases you from time. To bring in the quality of time - time, not in the chronological sense, but as the medium, as the psychological process, the process of the mind - is destructive, and creates confusion.

So, we can have understanding of what is when we recognize it without condemnation, without justification, without identification. To know that one is in a certain condition, in a certain state, is already a process of liberation; but a man who is not aware of his condition, of his struggle, tries to be something other than he is,

which brings about habit. So, then, let us keep in mind that we want to examine what is, to observe and be aware of exactly what is the actual, without giving it any slant, without giving it an interpretation. It needs an extraordinarily astute mind, an extraordinarily pliable heart, to be aware of and to follow what is; because what is, is constantly moving, constantly undergoing a transformation, and if the mind is tethered to belief, to knowledge, it ceases to pursue, it ceases to follow the swift movement of what is. What is, is not static, surely - it is constantly moving, as you will see if you observe it very closely. And to follow it, you need a very swift mind and a pliable heart which are denied when the mind is static, fixed in a belief, in a prejudice, in an identification; and a mind and heart that are dry cannot follow easily, swiftly, that which is.

So, what are we going to do in all these talks, discussions, questions and answers? I am just going to say what is and follow the movement of what is; and you will understand what is, only if you also are capable of following it.

One is aware, I think, without too much discussion, too much verbal expression, that there is individually as well as collective chaos, confusion and misery. It is not only in India, but right throughout the world; in China, America, England, Germany, all over the world, there is confusion, mounting sorrow. It is not only national, it is not particularly here, it is all over the world. There is extraordinarily acute suffering, and it is not individual only, but collective. So, it is a world catastrophe, and to limit it merely to a geographical area, a coloured section of the map, is absurd; because then we will not understand the full significance of this

worldwide as well as individual suffering. Being aware of this confusion, what is our response today? How do we react?

There is suffering, political, social, religious; our whole psychological being is confused, and all the leaders, political and religious, have failed us; all the books have lost their significance. You may go to the Bhagavad Gita or the Bible or the latest treatise on politics or psychology, and you will find that they have lost that ring, that quality of truth; they have become mere words. You yourself, who are the repeater of those words, are confused and uncertain, and mere repetition of words conveys nothing.

Therefore, the words and the books have lost their value; that is, if you quote the Bible, or Marx, or the Bhagavad Gita, as you who quote it, are yourself uncertain, confused, your repetition becomes a lie. Because, what is written there becomes mere propaganda, and propaganda is not truth. So, when you repeat, you have ceased to understand your own state of being. You are merely covering with words of authority your own confusion. But what we are trying to do, is to understand this confusion and not cover it up with quotations. So, what is your response to it? How do you respond to this extraordinary chaos, this confusion, this uncertainty of existence? Be aware of it, as I discuss it; follow, not my words, but the thought which is active in you. Most of us are accustomed to be spectators, and not to partake in the game. We read books, but we never write books. It has become our tradition, our national and universal habit, to be the spectators, to look on at a football game, to watch the public politicians and orators. We are merely the outsiders, looking on, and we have lost the creative capacity. Therefore, we want to absorb and partake.

But here, in this crowd, if you are merely observing, if you are merely spectators, you will lose entirely the significance of this discourse, because this is not a lecture which you are to listen to from force of habit. I am not going to give you information which you can pick up in an encyclopedia. What we are trying to do, is to follow each other's thoughts, to pursue as far as we can, as profoundly as we can, the intimations, the responses of our own feelings. So, please find out what your response is to this cause, to this suffering; not what somebody else's words are, but how you yourself respond. Your response is one of indifference if you benefit by the suffering, by the chaos, if you derive profit from it, either economic, social, political or psychological. Therefore, you do not mind to have this chaos continue. Surely, the more trouble there is in the world the more chaos, the more one seeks security. Haven't you noticed it? When there is confusion in the world, psychologically and in every way, you enclose yourself in some kind of security, either that of a bank account or that of an ideology; or else you turn to prayer, you go to the temple - which is really escaping from what is happening in the world. More and more sects are being formed, more and more 'isms' are springing up all over the world. Because, the more confusion there is, the more you want a leader, somebody who will guide you out of this mess; so you turn to the religious books, or to one of the latest teachers; or else you act and respond according to a system which appears to solve the problem, a system either of the left or of the right. So, that is exactly what is happening.

The moment you are aware of confusion, of exactly what is, you try to escape from it. And those sects which offer you a system for

the solution of suffering, economic, social or religious, are the worst; because then, system becomes important and not man - whether it be a religious system, or a system of the left or of the right. System becomes important, the philosophy, the idea, becomes important, and not man; and for the sake of the idea, of the ideology, you are willing to sacrifice all mankind, which is exactly what is happening in the world. This is not merely my interpretation; if you observe, you will find that is exactly what is happening. The system has become important. Therefore, as the system has become important, man, you and I, lose significance; and the controllers of the system, whether religious or social, whether of the left or of the right, assume authority, assume power, and therefore sacrifice you, the individual. That is exactly what is happening.

Now what is the cause of this confusion this misery? How did this misery come about, this suffering, not only inwardly but outwardly, this fear and expectation of war, the third world war that is breaking out? What is the cause of it? Surely, if you seek the cause according to Marx, or according to Spengler, or according to the Bhagavad Gita, you will not understand it, will you? You have to find out for yourself what the cause is, you must know the truth of it, see it as it actually is and not as someone else sees it. So, what is the truth of it? First of all, what is the significance of this confusion? Surely it indicates the collapse of all moral, spiritual values, and the glorification of all sensual values, of the value of things made by the hand or by the mind. What happens when we have no other values except the value of the things of the senses, the value of the products of the mind, of the hand or of the

machine? The more significance we give to the sensual value of things, the greater the confusion, is it not? Again, this is not my theory. When you are on the street, what is the predominating value that you have? You do not have to quote books to find out that your values, your riches, your economic and social existence are based on things made by the hand or by the mind. So, we live and function and have our being steeped in sensual values, which means that things, the things of the mind, the things of the hand and of the machine, have become important; and when things become important, belief becomes predominantly significant - which is exactly what is happening in the world, is it not?

I will go into this whole matter during the many talks which we are to have, but in this first talk I just want to show what is happening, to point out what is, so that we can be aware of the actual.

So, giving more and more significance to the values of the senses brings about confusion; and being in confusion, we try to escape from it through various forms, whether religious, economic or social, or through ambition, through power, through the search for reality. But the real is near, you do not have to seek it; and a man who seeks truth will never find it. Truth is in what is - and that is the beauty of it. But the moment you conceive it, the moment you seek it, you begin to struggle; and a man who struggles cannot understand. That is why we have to be still, observant, passively aware. We see that our living, our action, is always within the field of destruction, within the field of sorrow; like a wave, confusion and chaos always overtake us. There is no interval in the confusion of existence. I hope you see the significance of this - or do I have

to explain it a little further?

Whatever we do at present seems to lead to chaos, seems to lead to sorrow and unhappiness. Look at your own life and you will see that our living is always on the border of sorrow. Our work, our social activity, our politics, the various gatherings of nations to stop war, all produce further war. Destruction follows in the wake of living; whatever we do leads to death. That is what is actually taking place.

So, can we stop this misery at once, and not go on always being caught by the wave of confusion and sorrow? Am I making myself clear? That is, great teachers, whether the Buddha or the Christ, have come; they have accepted faith, making themselves, perhaps, free from confusion and sorrow. But they never prevented sorrow, they never stopped confusion. Confusion goes on, sorrow goes on. And if you, seeing this social and economic confusion, this chaos, this misery, withdraw into what is called the religious life and abandon the world, you may feel that you are joining these great Teachers; but the world goes on with its chaos, its misery and destruction, the everlasting suffering of its rich and poor. So, our problem, yours and mine, is whether we can step out of this misery instantaneously. If, living in the world, you refuse to be a part of it, you will help others out of this chaos - not in the future, not tomorrow, but now. Surely, that is our problem. The war is probably coming, more destructive, more appalling in its form. Surely, we cannot prevent it, because the issues are much too strong and too close. But you and I can perceive the confusion and misery immediately, can we not? We must perceive them, and then we will be in a position to awaken the same understanding of truth

in another. In other words, can you be instantaneously free? - because that is the only way out of this misery. Perception can take place only in the present; but if you say, 'I will do it tomorrow', the wave of confusion overtakes you, and you are then always involved in confusion.

So, is it possible to come to that state when you yourself perceive the truth instantaneously, and therefore put an end to confusion? I say that it is, and that it is the only possible way. I say it can be done and must be done, not based on supposition or belief. To bring about this extraordinary revolution - which is not the revolution to get rid of the capitalists and install another group - , to bring about this wonderful transformation, which is the only true revolution, is the problem. What is generally called revolution is merely the modification or the continuance of the right according to the ideas of the left. The left, after all, is the continuation of the right in a modified form. If the right is based on sensual values, the left is but the continuance of the same sensual values, different only in degree or expression. So, true revolution can take place only when you, the individual, become aware in your relationship to another. Surely, what you are in your relationship to another, to your wife, your child, your boss, your neighbour, is society. Society by itself is non-existent. Society is what you and I, in our relationship, have created; it is the outward projection of all of our own inward psychological states. So, if you and I do not understand ourselves, merely transforming the outer, which is the projection of the inner, has no significance whatsoever; that is, there can be no significant alteration or modification in society as long as I do not understand myself in relationship to you. Being



confused in my relationship, I create a society which is the replica, the outward expression of what I am. This is an obvious fact, which we can discuss. We can discuss whether society, the outward expression, has produced me, or whether I have produced society. We can go into that later. So, is it not an obvious fact that what I am in my relationship to another, creates society; and that, without radically transforming myself, there can be no transformation of the essential function of society? When we look to a system for the transformation of society, we are merely evading, the question, because a system cannot transform man; man always transforms the system, which history shows. Until I, in my relationship to you, understand myself, I am the cause of chaos, misery, destruction, fear, brutality. Understanding myself is not a matter of time; that is, I can understand myself this very moment. If I say, 'I will understand myself tomorrow', I am bringing in chaos and misery, my action is destructive. The moment I say that I 'will' understand, I bring in the time element and so am already caught up in the wave of confusion and destruction. Surely, understanding is now, not tomorrow. Tomorrow is for the lazy mind, the sluggish mind, the mind that is not interested. When you are interested in something, you do it instantaneously, there is immediate understanding, immediate transformation. If you do not change now, you will never change; because the change that takes place tomorrow is merely a modification, it is not transformation. Transformation can only take place immediately; the revolution is now, not tomorrow.

You all look so baffled. Why? Because you say, 'How can I change now? I, who am a product of the past, of innumerable

conditionings, I, who am a bundle of mannerisms, how can I change, how can I throw all that away and be free?' But if you do not throw it all away, if there is not that tremendous revolution, you will always live with chaos. So, how is it possible for this instantaneous revolution to take place? I hope you see the importance of immediate change. If you do not see that, you miss the whole significance of it. Understanding does not come tomorrow; there is understanding now, or never. The present is always the continuation of the past, So, can I, who am a result of the past, whose being is founded on the past, I who am the outcome of yesterday - can I step out of time, not chronologically but psychologically? Surely, you do step out of time when you are vitally interested - you take a stride in that timeless existence, which is not an illusion a self-induced hallucination. When that happens, you are completely without a problem, for then the self is not worried about itself; and then you are beyond the wave of destruction. And during these talks, that timeless transformation is the only thing that I am going to be concerned with. I cannot induce it in you, that would be false. But if you follow freely, without resistance, with understanding, you will find yourselves very often in that state of immediate perception and therefore of immediate transformation.

Question: I am born with a certain temperament, a certain psychological and physical pattern, whatever may be its reason. This pattern becomes the major single factor in my life. It dominates me absolutely. My freedom within the pattern is very limited the majority of my reactions and impulses being rigidly predetermined. Can I break up the tyranny of this genetic factor?

Krishnamurti: To put it differently, I am caught in a pattern, social, hereditary, environmental, ideological, whether it is the pattern of my parents or of the society about me. I am hemmed in by a pattern, and the question is, how am I to break it up? I am the result of my father and mother, biologically, physically. I am the result of my parents' beliefs, habits, fears, which have created the society around me. My parents, in turn, were the result of their parents, with their social, physical, psychological environment, and so on backward indefinitely, timelessly, without a beginning. Each person is held with a pattern of existence, and I am the result of all that past - not just my own past, but the whole past of mankind. I am, after all, the son of my father. I am the result of the past modified in conjunction with the present. We are not bringing in the question of reincarnation, which is merely a theory. We are just examining what really is. My existence is the result of my past, my past being the result of my father's existence. I am the outcome of time, I am the past going through the present to become the future. I am the result of yesterday, which is today becoming tomorrow.

Now, can I step out of that process of time, that is, can I break away from the pattern which my father and I myself have created? I am not different from my father; I am my father, modified. That is exactly what is. But if I begin to translate what is, if, for example, I bring in the idea that I am the soul, a spiritual entity, then I step into another realm altogether. That is not the point for the moment - we will discuss that when we go into the problem of what is soul, what is continuity, what is reincarnation. The problem at the present moment is: Can I, who am conditioned - whether by the left or by the right is irrelevant - , can I step out of that

conditioning?

What is it that conditions you? What is it that limits thought? What is it that creates the pattern in which you are caught? If I cease to think, then there is no pattern. That is, I am the thinker, my thoughts are the outcome of yesterday, I respond to every new challenge according to the pattern of yesterday or of the past second; and can I, whose thinking process is the outcome of yesterday, cease to think in terms of yesterday? I am only explaining the problem differently, and you will find the answer for yourself in a minute. My thought is conditioned, because any response from the conditioned state creates further conditioning; any action from the conditioned state is a conditioned action, and therefore gives continuity to the conditioned state. Therefore, to step out of it, there must be freedom from condition, which means freedom from the process of thinking - which does not mean that I am suggesting this as a means of escape. Most people do try to escape because life is too urgent, too strong, too demanding for them. I am not proposing such an escape; I am just asking you to look at the truth of the problem. Can you be free of the process of thinking? Can there be a complete revolution in thinking - not according to the old pattern, which is the continuation of the old with values modified, but - , a complete transformation, a total breaking up of what is? As I am the product of yesterday, freedom obviously does not lie on the same level, which would merely be a continuation of yesterday. So, I can step out of it only when there is cessation of thinking.

We are just looking at the problem, not seeking an answer; because the answer is in the problem, not away from the problem.

If you understand the problem, the answer is there; whereas if you are looking for an answer and you fail, you are puzzled. You are waiting for me to tell you how to step out of the pattern. I am not going to tell you how to step out of it; it has no meaning if I tell you how, because then you are not following the problem. You are waiting for me to tell you what to do, and therefore you are very puzzled. I am not going to tell you what to do; because, if you understand the problem, the problem ceases. When you see a snake and know it is poisonous, there is no problem, is there? You know what to do - you do not touch it. You go away, or do something else. Similarly, you must understand this problem completely - which you are not doing. I am doing it for you, and you are merely listening to me. We must understand the problem, not ask how to solve it. When you understand the problem, surely, the problem itself reveals the answer. It is like a schoolboy taking an examination. He does not read the problem carefully, he wants the answer; and therefore he fails. But if he reads the problem very slowly, very carefully, looking at it from all angles, then he will find the answer - or rather, the answer is there.

Similarly, you are looking at this problem with the desire for a answer. I do not think you see the beauty of it. Probably you are tired, Sirs.

Comment from Audience: No.

Krishnamurti: Yes, you are tired. I will tell you why. Probably this is all very new to you, it must be, it is a new approach altogether; so you are a bit puzzled, and when you are puzzled or bewildered, the mind wanders off. I can go on, it is my job; but I have done this, I am not just talking. Whereas with you, Sirs, if I

may say so, you are not studying the problem. I have put it in different ways, but you refuse to follow it. I am just pointing out what is, which is the problem. But you are not interested in studying what is. You are waiting to see the outcome, whereas I am not interested in the outcome. I want to understand the thing as it is - therefore I have found the answer.

So, let me again request you please to follow the problem itself, and not look for an answer. Please see the importance of this: to look for an answer, for a solution, is not to understand the problem; and if you do not understand the problem, there is no answer to that problem. The problem is here, and you are looking for the answer there - which means that you will find an answer which is convenient, gratifying. But if you look at the problem very carefully, very intelligently, then you will see the beauty of it and then the outcome is marvellous.

So, the problem is this: my thought is conditioned, it is fixed in a pattern; and to any challenge, which is always new, my thought can respond only according to its conditioning, transforming the new into the modified old. Therefore, my thought can never be free. My thought, which is the outcome of yesterday, can respond only in terms of yesterday; and when it asks, 'how can I go beyond?', it is asking a wrong question. Because, when thought seeks to beyond its own conditioning, it continues itself in a modified way. Therefore, there is a falseness in that question. There is freedom only when there is no conditioning; but for freedom to be, thought must be aware of its condition and not try to become something other than it is. If thought says, 'I must free myself from my conditioning', it never can; because whatever it

does is its own net continued or modified. All that thought can do is to cease to be. Surely, the moment thought is active, it is conditioned, is continuity modified by a conditioned response. So, along that line there is no way to step out of conditioning. Therefore, there is only one way, which is vertical, which is straight - for thought to cease.

Now, can thinking cease? What is thinking, what do we mean by thinking? We mean by thinking, the response of memory. I am making it very simple. I do not want to complicate it, because the problem itself is quite complex. Thinking is the response of memory; and what is memory? Memory is the residue of experience. That is, when there is a challenge, yesterday's thought, which is memory, responds to that challenge, and therefore that challenge is not fully understood but is interpreted through the screen of yesterday. So, what is not understood leaves a mark, which we call memory. Have you not noticed that when you have understood something, when you have completed a conversation, when it is finished, it does not leave a mark? It is only an incomplete act, whether verbal or physical, that leaves a mark. The response of that mark, which is memory, is called thinking. So, can there be a state in which there is no yesterday, that is, can there be a state when there is no time, no thought that is the product of yesterday? Conditioned thought that seeks to modify or change itself merely continues the conditioned state. That is fairly obvious. Thinking is the response of memory - which is obvious too. And memory is the outcome of imperfect understanding of experience, of challenge. Imperfect understanding of experience is the cause of memory. When you do something with all your being integrated, it

leaves no residue of memory; but when the residue gives response, that response we call thinking. Such thinking is conditioned, and that conditioning can come to an end only when the act is complete. That means you meet everything anew.

How can you meet everything anew? How can you meet life, existence, anew, in the sense of 'without time'? It is a new question, is it not? That is the question arising out of this question. When I put that new question to you, what is your response? If your response is also new, then you are passively aware, alert, watching. That state is timeless. In that state, when you meet everything with passive alertness, awareness, there is no time; there is a direct experience, the challenge is directly understood; therefore there is freedom from thinking. And that freedom is eternal; it is now, not tomorrow.

January 18, 1948.



## **BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC TALK 25TH JANUARY, 1948**

This meeting will be held hereafter at 6 o'clock every Sunday evening here, and the discussions at Carmichael Road will be on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays at 6 o'clock.

Perhaps some of you will remember what I was discussing in my talk last Sunday. I was saying that in understanding what is, we shall find the truth of a problem; and it is extremely difficult to understand what is, because what is is never static, it is constantly in motion. A mind that wishes to understand a problem must not only understand the problem completely, wholly, but must be able to follow it swiftly, because the problem is never static. The problem is always new, whether it is a problem of starvation, a psychological problem, or any problem. Any crisis is always new; therefore, to understand it, a mind must always be fresh, clear, swift in its pursuit. I think most of us realize the urgency of an inward revolution, which alone can bring about a radical transformation of the outer, of society. This is the problem with which I myself and all seriously-intentioned people are occupied. How to bring about a fundamental, a radical transformation in society, is our problem; and, as I said last Sunday, this transformation of the outer cannot take place without inner revolution. Because, society is always static, any action, any reform which is accomplished without this inward revolution, becomes equally static; so there is no hope without this constant inward revolution, because, without it, outer action becomes repetitive, habitual. The action of relationship between you and

another, between you and me, is society; and that society becomes static, it has no life-giving quality, as long as there is not this constant inward revolution, a creative, psychological transformation; and it is because there is not this constant inward revolution that society is always becoming static, crystallized and has therefore constantly to be broken up.

So, our problem, is it not?, is whether there can be a society which is static, and at the same time an individual in whom this constant revolution is taking place. That is, revolution in society must begin with the inner, psychological transformation of the individual. Most of us want to see a radical transformation in the social structure. That is the whole battle that is going on in the world - to bring about a social revolution through communistic or any other means. Now, if there is a social revolution, that is, an action with regard to the outer structure of man, however radical that social revolution may be, its very nature is static if there is no inward revolution of the individual, no psychological transformation. So, to bring about a society that is not repetitive, not static, not disintegrating, that is constantly alive, it is imperative that there should be a revolution in the psychological structure of the individual; for without inward, psychological revolution, mere transformation of the outer has very little significance. That is, society is always becoming crystallized, static, and is therefore always disintegrating. However much and however wisely legislation may be promulgated, society is always in the process of decay; because revolution must take place within, not merely outwardly.

I think it is important to understand this, and not slur over it.

Outward action, when accomplished, is over, is static; and if the relationship between individuals, which is society, is not the outcome of inward revolution, then the social structure, being static, absorbs the individual, and therefore makes him equally static, repetitive. Realizing this, realizing the extraordinary significance of what I have said, which is a fact, there can be no question of agreement or disagreement. It is a fact that society is always crystallizing and absorbing the individual; and that constant, creative revolution can only be in the individual, not in society, not in the outer. That is, creative revolution can take place only in individual relationship, which is society. We see how the structure of the present society in India, in Europe, in America, in every part of the world, is rapidly disintegrating; and we know it within our own lives. We can observe it as we go down the streets. We do not need great historians to tell us the fact that our society is crumbling; and there must be new architects, new builders, to create a new society. The structure must be built on a new foundation, on newly discovered facts and values. Such architects do not yet exist. There are no builders, none who, observing, becoming aware of the fact that the structure is collapsing, are transforming themselves into architects. So, that is our problem. We see society crumbling, disintegrating; and it is we, you and I, who have to be the architects. You and I have to re-discover the values and build on a more fundamental, lasting foundation; because if we look to the professional architects, the political and religious builders, we shall be precisely in the same position as before.

Now, because the individual, you and I, are not creative, we

have reduced society to this chaos. So, you and I have to be creative, because the problem is urgent; you and I must be aware of the causes of the collapse of society and create a new structure based, not on mere imitation, but on our creative understanding. Now, this implies, does it not?, negative thinking. Negative thinking is the highest form of understanding. That is, in order to understand what is creative thinking, we must approach the problem negatively; because a positive approach to the problem - which is that you and I must become creative in order to build a new structure of society - will be imitative. To understand that which is crumbling, we must investigate it, examine it negatively, not with a positive system, a positive formula, a positive conclusion.

So, why is society crumbling, collapsing as it surely is? One of the fundamental reasons is that the individual, you, have ceased to be creative. I will explain what I mean. You and I have become imitative, we are copying, outwardly and inwardly. Outwardly, when learning a technique, when communicating with each other on the verbal level, naturally there must be some imitation, copy. I copy words. To become an engineer, I must first learn the technique and use the technique to build a bridge. So, there must be a certain amount of imitation copying, in outward technique. But, when there is inward, psychological imitation, surely, we cease to be creative. Our education, our social structure, our so-called religious life, are all based on imitation; that is, I fit into a particular social or religious formula. I have ceased to be a real individual; psychologically, I have become a mere repetitive machine with certain conditioned responses, whether those of the

Parsi, the Hindu, the Christian, the Buddhist, the German or the Englishman. Our responses are conditioned according to the pattern of society, whether it is Eastern or Western, religious or materialistic. So, one of the fundamental causes of the disintegration of society is imitation and one of the disintegrating factors is the leader, whose very essence is imitation.

So, in order to understand the nature of disintegrating society, is it not important to enquire whether you and I, the individual, can be creative? We can see that when there is imitation, there must be disintegration; when there is authority, there must be copying. And since our whole mental, psychological make-up is based on authority, there must be freedom from authority to be creative. Have you not noticed that in moments of creativeness, those rather happy moments of vital interest, there is no sense of repetition, no sense of copying? Such moments are always new, fresh, creative, happy. So, one of the fundamental causes of the disintegration of society is copying, which is the worship of authority.

Please do not agree with me. It is not a question of agreement, but of understanding what is. If you merely agree with me, you will make me your authority; but if you understand, you will cease to worship authority, because the problem is not a matter of substituting one authority for another, but of being creative. When you try to become creative, then you need authority; but when you are creative, there is no authority, there is no copying. There is a difference between becoming and being. Becoming admits time, and being is free of time. In becoming you must have authority, an example, an ideal, you must have tomorrow. In being, there is the cessation of time, therefore there is immediate revolution, which

we will discuss as we go along during the many talks we are going to have here.

So, it is important to understand first that our approach to any problem must be negative, because any positive approach is merely imitation. And to understand this crumbling social structure, we must approach it negatively, and not through a system, whether that of the left or of the right; and in that approach, we will find that negative thinking is the highest form of understanding, which alone is going to solve the many difficulties of our whole existence.

I have several questions, and I will go ahead with the answers. In all these talks I will make introductory remarks, as I have done just now, and then answer questions.

Question: What is your solution to the problem of starvation?

Krishnamurti: Now, let us first examine the question itself. As I said last Sunday, I have not studied this question. I am considering it now for the first time, So, we are going to examine and understand this problem together, which means you are not going to become the listeners, the observers, and I the one who answers. We are going to examine this problem very carefully together, step by step, because it is your problem as well as mine. So, please do not wait for an answer, but see the implications, the significance of this question, all that is implied in it. Because, as I said, the problem contains the answer; the answer is never outside the problem. If I can understand the problem with all its significance, then the answer is there; but if you have an answer, then you will never understand the problem, because the answer, the conclusion, the formula, intervenes between the problem and yourself. Then

you are merely concerned with the answer, and not with the problem itself.

Now the question is, "What is your solution to the problem of starvation?" Will any solution bring about an end to starvation? Will any system - which is always implied in a solution - put an end to starvation, whether the system be of the modified right, or of the extreme left? Will the modification of capitalistic society, or a communistic system, put an end to starvation? That is what is implied in this question. When you ask about a solution, you mean a system, don't you? I am not putting into the question something that isn't there. We have several systems: the fascistic, the communistic, the capitalistic systems. As they have not solved the problem of starvation, have you a system that will solve it? So, can any system bring about the ending of starvation?

Now, systems become more important than feeding people when the system intervenes between the problem and yourself. Let me put it this way. Why have systems become important? Why have these intervening systems, whether of the left or of the right, become important? They have become important because we think they will solve the problem, that by outward application of certain legislative action, that is, by the outward compulsion of the possessors, of those who have in their hands the things, the machinery, we are going to put an end to the problem. We think that by compulsion we are going to transform society and put an end to starvation. I hope you are following this. We give importance to systems because we think through compulsion, through legislation, through outward action, we can end starvation. Obviously, to a certain extent that is true - we need not even

discuss it. But that is not the whole problem, is it? Why have food, clothing, and shelter, become so important in man's life? They are necessary, that is an obvious fact. It would be stupid, one would have to be quite disarranged mentally, to say that they are not necessary. But why have they assumed such overwhelming importance? Do you understand? Or rather, I hope I am making myself clear - it is more polite to put it that way! Why have property, relationship, idea, ideology, become all-consuming - for they are the same thing as food, clothing and shelter, only on a different plane of thought. That is, we look to a system to solve this problem; we say this or that is the best system, the communistic, the socialistic, or the capitalistic, and there we stop. Surely, this is not the answer. If we go a little deeper into the problem, we will ask ourselves why these things, made by the hand or by the mind, have become so extraordinarily significant in our lives. Is it because we need food, clothing, and shelter? But why have they become such a dominating influence in our lives? Surely, if I can find out the truth of that question, then food, clothing, and shelter, however necessary, will become of secondary importance. Then I shall not give undue significance to these things, because I shall not mind whether I have a little more or a little less. Therefore, it is irrelevant to me whether society is organized by this or by that group - I shall not kill, I shall not join either of them to be destroyed by the other. Do you follow? When systems become important, the problem itself becomes secondary; because emphasis is laid on the system, and not on the problem. That is what is happening in the world at the present time. If the whole world were concerned with feeding man, surely, then, the problem



would be very simple. The scientists have already discovered enough to make possible the feeding, clothing, and sheltering of man. That is an irrefutable fact. But we do not avail ourselves of these possibilities because we are more concerned with systems than with the feeding of man. We say, 'My system is better than your system', and we are preparing to destroy, butcher, liquidate each other. Therefore, what happens? The poor man who is hungry, remains hungry. Whereas, if we do not look to systems, but find out what are the implications of the problem itself, then systems can be used, but they will not become our masters.

So, what are the implications of the problem? Why has man, that is, why have you and I, given such an extraordinarily dominant significance to things, to property, to food, clothing, and shelter? We give importance to sensate values, which are food, clothing and shelter, because we use them as a means of psychological self-expansion. That is, food, clothing, and shelter are used by the individual for his own psychological aggrandisement. After all, property has very little meaning in itself. But, psychologically, property becomes of extraordinary significance, because it gives you position, prestige, name, title. So, since it gives you power, position, authority, you hold on to it; and on that you build a system which destroys the equitable distribution of things to man. So, as long as you and I psychologically use property, name, belief - which are the same as food, clothing, and shelter, on a different level - there must be starvation, there must be conflict between man and man. I may not seek power through property, but I become the commissar, the bureaucrat, wielding enormous power, which again brings tension between man and man. As long as you

and I, or any group of people, are using food, clothing and shelter as a means of exploitation, of power, the problem of starvation will continue. A system is not the solution to the problem, because a system is in the hands of the few; therefore, the system becomes important. This does not mean that there must not be a system to regulate man and his greed; but this problem can be solved radically, fundamentally, and for all, not through any system, but only when you and I are aware that we are using property, things made by the hand or by the mind, as a means of self-expansion. After all, remove your name, your title, your property, your B.A.'s and M.A.'s, and what are you? You are really a nonentity, aren't you? Without your property, without your medals and all the rest of it, you are nothing. And to cover up that emptiness, you use property, you use name, family. The psychological emptiness of man ever seeks to cover itself with property, which is food, clothing, and shelter.

So, the problem of starvation is much more psychological than legislative; it is not a matter of mere enforcement. If we really see the truth of this, we will stop using things as a means of self-expansion and therefore we will help to bring about a new social order. Surely, that is the truth of it: that you and I use things made by the hand or by the mind as a means of self-expansion, and therefore we give extraordinary significance to sensate values. But if we do not give a wrong significance to sensate values, that is, if we do not give the predominating importance to food, clothing, and shelter, then the problem is simple and very easily solved. Then the scientists will come together and give us food, clothing and shelter; but they will not do it now, because, like you and me, they belong

to a society which uses things as a means of self-expansion. The scientists are like the rest of us; they may be different in the laboratory, but they are conditioned like you and me. They are nationalistic, psychologically seeking power, and so on. Therefore, there is no solution through them. The only solution to this problem is in ourselves. That is the truth; and if you really understand it, there will be a revolution, that inward revolution which is creative; and therefore there will be a society which is not merely static but creative because it represents you and me. Sir, in understanding what is, which is the problem, truth is discovered. It is the immediate perception of truth that is liberating, not ideation. Ideas merely breed further ideas, and ideas are not in any way going to give happiness to man. Only when ideation ceases is there being; and being is the solution.

Question: You say we can remain aware even when in sleep. Please explain.

Krishnamurti: This is really a very complex problem needing very careful observation and swift following of thought, and I hope you and I will be able to do it together. I am going to explain this question. Please follow it in yourselves, and not merely listen to my verbal explanation; follow it step by step as I go into it.

Consciousness is made up of many layers, is it not? Consciousness is not merely the superficial layer; it is made up of many, many layers, the layers being the hidden motives, the unrevealed intentions, the unsolved problems, memory, tradition, the impingement of the past on the present, the continuation of the past through the present to the future. All that, and more, is consciousness. I am considering what consciousness actually is,

not a theory. The many layers of memories, all thoughts, the hidden problems which are not solved and which create memory, the racial instincts, the past in conjunction with the present creating the future - all that is consciousness.

Now, most of us are aware, are functioning, only within the superficial layers of consciousness. I hope you are interested in all this; but whether you are interested or not, it is a fact. If merely for information, listen to it. First, I have not read using any special terminology, any jargon of the psychologists; nor have I read any of your sacred books, either of the East or of the West. But in being aware of oneself, one discovers all these things. In oneself is the whole of wisdom. Self-knowledge is the beginning of understanding, and without self-knowledge, there is no right thinking, there is no basis for thought. In understanding this, we are exploring self-knowledge, we are exploring consciousness; and you can explore it directly while I am talking, you can be aware of yourself and have direct experience; or you can merely listen verbally, for information: you can take your choice, it is up to you.

So, most of us function in the superficial layers of consciousness; therefore we remain shallow, and therefore our action brings further responses, further reactions, further misery. There is release, liberation, only when the whole of consciousness is thoroughly understood. It is not a matter of time - which we will go into later, during the course of these talks. So, since we function only in the superficial layers of consciousness, naturally it creates problems; it never solves problems, but is always the breeding ground of problems. That is, as most of the activities of our daily existence are the response of those superficially cultivated layers,

the whole bag of layers is always breeding more and more problems. Now, when you have a problem created by the superficial layers of consciousness, you try to solve it superficially, like a dog worrying a bone, gnawing at it, struggling with it - that is always the case with the superficial layers of consciousness; and you do not find a solution. Then, what happens? You go to bed, you sleep on it; and when you wake up, you find you have solved the problem, or you see a new way of looking at it and you can solve it. This happens all times to all of us. It is not something extraordinary or mysterious, it is well-known. Now, exactly what has happened? This upper layer of consciousness, the man, the superficial man, has thought about the problem all day long, worried over it, trying to translate it according to his demands, to his prejudices, to his immediate desires. That is, he is seeking an answer, and therefore cannot find it. Then he goes to sleep, and when he is asleep, the superficial consciousness, the upper layer of the mind, is somewhat quiet, relaxed, free from the incessant worry over the problem. Then, into that superficial layer, the hidden projects its solution; and when you wake up, the problem has a different significance. That is a fact. You do not have to become an occultist, you do not have to become very clever to understand it - which would be absurd. If you observe it for yourself, you will see that it is an obvious, everyday fact. But this does not mean that you have to go to sleep to have your problem answered. The problem is there; and if you can approach it openly, without any conclusion, without any answer intervening between you and the problem, then you are immediately and directly in relationship with the problem, and therefore you are open to the hints of the unconscious.

Have I explained it too quickly? Perhaps I have. But it doesn't matter, Sir. We are going to meet again several times, because this is a question one has to go into much more deeply. We have touched only one part of it, although most of us are content to leave it at that level.

The next point involved in this question is the intimation of the unconscious. Surely, our life is not mere superficial existence. There are vast, hidden resources, treasures of extraordinary importance, of extraordinary delight and greatness and joy, which are always hinting, intimating; and because we are not capable of receiving them directly when we are awake, they become symbols, as dreams, when we sleep. That is, the unconscious, the deep layers, the layers which have not been explored, are always giving intimations, hints of extraordinary significance; but the superficial consciousness is so occupied with its daily existence, its daily worries, its pursuit of bread and butter, that it is incapable of receiving the intimations directly. Therefore the intimations become dreams; and dreams require interpreters, so the psychologists come in and make money. Whereas, there need be no interpretation if there is immediate and direct contact with the unconscious; and this can take place only when the conscious mind is continually being quiet, constantly having an interval, a space between action and action, between thought and thought.

Then the other point involved in this is the subjective experience of conversation with another. I do not know if you have ever remembered, when you wake up, having had a long talk with somebody - remembering words, or a word, with extraordinary potency and meaning. This must have happened to you - you

remember having a discussion with a friend, with a man whom you respect, with an ascetic, guru or Master. Now, what is that? Is it not still within the field of consciousness? It is still a part of consciousness; therefore it is a self-projection which is translated upon awakening as a conversation with somebody, a direction received from a Master. The Master is still within the framework of consciousness, and it is therefore a projection of the self into the image of the Master. The remembering of a word and the giving of significance to it is one of the ways in which the unconscious functions to impress itself upon the conscious mind. So, this remembering of an event within the field of consciousness is still the intimation or the projection of thought; it is a creation of thought, and therefore not the real. The real comes into being only when thought ceases, when thought no longer creates. The next point involved in the question - and I hope you do not mind my exploring it further - is whether during sleep it is possible to meet a person objectively. Do you understand? That is, can I, during sleep, meet someone objectively, not subjectively? Now that implies identification of thought as the 'I'. What is the 'I'? What is thought, identified? When I say 'Krishnamurti', I mean thought in which there is identification as the man. The man is thought, objectified, which is a continuity; and, surely, it is possible to meet that continuity objectively. This has been proved over and over again - objectively, not subjectively. That is, thought, which is like a wave, a moving wave, is identified, given a name; and that, surely, you can meet objectively.

So, those are some of the things involved in this question of remaining aware even in sleep. But all these explanations have no

significance whatsoever without self-knowledge. You may repeat what I have said, but repetition is a lie; it is merely propaganda, and it is not true. These things must be experienced, not repeated; and you must experience what is; be aware of the many layers of consciousness which expresses itself in so many different ways.

So, there is a very narrow margin of division between the waking-consciousness and the sleeping-consciousness; but since most of you are almost entirely occupied with the waking consciousness, with its worries, its beliefs, the daily anxieties of earning a livelihood, the tension of relationship between yourself and another, all these are preventing the exploration of yourself at a deeper level. And you do not have to explore - surely, the hidden projects itself with an enormous quickness when the mind is not superficially active. Have you not noticed it when you are sitting quietly, not occupied with the radio, when the mind suddenly has a new idea, a new feeling, a new joy; but, unfortunately, what happens? When that creative expression comes into being, you immediately translate it into action, and you want a repetition of it. Therefore, you have lost it. So, the problem of awareness, which we have now dealt with partly, is really very creative, if you can understand it fully. I will go into it later, into the significance of what it is to be aware, But it is important to understand, is it not?, that there cannot be right thinking and therefore right action without self-knowledge; and self-knowledge is not merely the comprehension of the superficial layers, but the complete understanding of the whole consciousness. This is not a matter of time; for, if the attention is there, there is immediate perception, and the urgency of that perception depends on how honest one is.



The more one is alert, passively aware, the more one comprehends the deeper layers of consciousness; and I assure you, there is an extraordinary joy in it, in discovering, in fathoming one's whole being. If you pursue understanding, it escapes you; but if you are passively aware, then it unfolds and gives its extraordinary depths.

Shall I go on to the next question? Are you tired? Alright, I shall go on with it.

Question: You say that full awareness of the problem liberates us from the problem. Awareness depends on interest. What creates interest, what makes one man interested and another indifferent?

Krishnamurti: Now, again we are going to examine the question, the problem itself. So, do not intervene with an answer. We are going to discover the content of the problem, and not search out a conclusion. Because, if we have a conclusion, the problem is not understood; if we have answers to our various problems, the problems are never examined. We either quote the Bhagavad Gita, or one of our latest leaders, or a guru, and so never look at the problem itself - which means, we are never directly in relationship with the problem because there is always an intervention between us and the problem in the shape of a conclusion, in the shape of a quotation or an answer. There is never a direct relationship between you and the problem, so the problem loses its significance. To be aware of the problem directly, you have first to be aware that you are intervening, putting a screen between yourself and the problem. Are you? Become directly aware of your own problem, not somebody else's, and you will see what happens. Let us experiment with that. You will see how quickly you can dissolve the problem, if you follow what I am

going to suggest.

If you have a problem, what is your first response to that problem? Your instant response is that you are looking for an answer. You want to solve it, which means; you want to run away from the problem by means of an answer; that is, you are more concerned with the discovery of the answer than with the study of the problem. Your guru, your Bhagavad Gita, intervene, which means they are really an escape from the problem. That is a fact, that is what is happening to you. Now, if that is a fact, what happens? You are not concerned with the problem which you are trying to understand; so naturally the problem falls away, and therefore you are not directly in contact with the problem. But what happens when you are directly confronted with the problem without any intervention, when you are directly related to the problem? The problem ceases to be a problem - you understand it entirely, immediately. So, to be aware of a problem implies awareness of the interventions, that is, of the escapes, of the answers, of the unconsciously or consciously seeking in order to avoid the problem - which means that you are not really concerned with the understanding of the problem. So, to have that awareness of a problem, dissolves the problem; it liberates us from the problem.

Every moment, the problem is a new problem; the problem is a challenge. Life is a challenge and a response; and when there is a challenge, which is always new, I respond according to my conditioning; but if I can meet the challenge without the conditioning - which is the answer, the conclusion, the quotation - then my mind, being fresh, is able to meet the challenge anew.

Therefore, it is capable of instantaneously understanding the problem. Please, it is not a question of your accepting my word for it - experiment with it and you will soon see how extraordinarily awareness dissolves the problem. You taste that awareness in moments of great crisis, when you have got to solve something, when something extraordinarily serious takes place in your life. Then you are not seeking an answer, a guide, an authority. That means you are not escaping from the problem, from the crisis, which means that you are meeting the challenge anew, afresh.

To continue with the question. "Awareness depends on interest. What creates interest...?" Why are you interested. Are you not interested now? You are actually listening to me; why? Either you are mesmerized by my words, or there is interest, obviously, I hope you are not mesmerized by my words. Therefore, there is interest. Why are you interested? Because I am interested. I am urgently interested in that which I am saying, and not only for the moment. I am interested vitally in solving the problems of man, which is myself; and because I am enthusiastically, keenly interested, you also are interested. But the moment will come, as soon as you leave this place, when you will fall back into the routine of your property, your ownership, your job, and all the rest of it. You are interested, because I am interested, because I am tremendously concerned. So interest is catching, only then it is not lasting. There is good influence, and bad influence; and since I am not interested in influencing you one way or the other, you lose interest. And to be influenced is wrong, it is fatal; because if you can be influenced by one, you can be influenced by another; like fashion, influence changes and therefore has no significance. But, if you are earnest

in yourself, then you are alive, not only now but constantly, to the enormous significance of the crisis. And if you are not interested, it is your misery. What makes one man interested, and another indifferent? What makes you not interested - that is the problem, not the indifference of another. Why are you indifferent? That is the problem, isn't it? Why are you indifferent to the problem of starvation, to the problem of consciousness, to the problem of finding a solution for all existing problems? What makes you indifferent? Why aren't you interested in all this? Have you ever sat down and thought about it? Obviously, we are not interested for the very simple reason that we want distractions: the guru, the leader, the Bhagavad Gita, the Bible and so on. They are all distractions, and distraction dulls the mind. The very function of a guru is to dull your mind. That is why you go to him - to pacify yourself, to give yourself satisfaction. Otherwise, if you did not seek satisfaction, you would never go to a guru. You want satisfaction, and therefore your mind is made dull; and in what can a dull mind interest itself? It is interested in everyday existence, how to put on a new sari beautifully. So, we are caught in the ways of dullness because to think very earnestly is to be discontented, which is very painful; and most of us do not want to invite sorrow. We want to avoid sorrow, and so our whole structure of thought is a confusion, is a distraction.

So, what is important is not who is indifferent, but why you yourself are so superficial. Why are you caught in this extraordinary net of suffering? Surely, the answer lies in discovering for ourselves the causes that make us dull, insensitive - insensitive to human suffering, to the trees, to the heavens, to the

birds; insensitive to our human relationships. To be sensitive means pain; but we must be painfully sensitive in order to understand. But we stop on this side of pain and try to escape from it, which reduces us to imitative machines.

January 25, 1948

## **BOMBAY 3RD PUBLIC TALK 1ST FEBRUARY, 1948**

Is it not important at all times, and especially during these critical days, to think very clearly and to know our feelings very intimately? Obviously, we are not separate from the crisis - whatever happens to a nation, to a group of people, is happening really to each one of us individually; and since we are so intimately connected, we ought to be fully aware and deliberately conscious of our thoughts and feelings. Because, if we are influenced, if we take sides, if we are persuaded by events and are not aware of the causes of the events, then we shall be merely carried away by the events; and as events, local and worldwide, are occurring with extraordinary rapidity, and as their impact is so very strong and fierce, it behoves us, surely, to be extremely clear in our thoughts and very fundamental in our feelings. Because, the stronger the event, the greater the outward mess, the more intense the turmoil and chaos within us. Outward events, being so very close to us, must naturally upset and disturb many; and I think it is right, is it not?, to have very strong feelings strong, directed emotions, unwarped and purposeful, because without any feeling, one is dead. Mere intellectual froth is of no significance in moments of great importance; and there is a danger of translating the great events intellectually and superficially, and thereby passing them by. Whereas, if we are able to follow very closely and very clearly the psychological causes of disturbance and maintain an emotional attention without the interference of the intellect, then perhaps we shall be able to perceive the significance of the issues. I am not

merely throwing out a lot of words for you to listen to, but rather, by talking it over together, as we are doing now, perhaps we shall be able to clarify the confused state of our own mind and emotions.

So, as I am going to answer questions this evening, I hope you will follow them, not merely verbally or intellectually, because that has very little significance; but rather follow what is being said as though it were actually happening. Because, surely, the responsibility for any crisis does not lie with another - it lies with you and me as individuals; and to understand any crisis, like the present one which is localized in India, we ought to approach it very diligently, with intensity, with clarification, with the intention of going into it very fully and seeing all its significance, all its depths. As I said, I am going to answer questions this evening; and answers have little meaning if you are merely waiting for an answer; but if we analyze, think out the problem together - not merely you listening and I explaining - , if we go into it together, then perhaps that very thought process will create an understanding, a revelation.

Question: What are the real causes of Mahatma Gandhi's untimely death?

Krishnamurti: I wonder what your reaction was when you heard the news. What was your response? Were you concerned over it as a personal loss, or as an indication of the trend of world events? If it was felt merely as an identified personal loss, then we have to analyze that feeling very carefully, very intelligently, very purposefully; and if it was seen as an indication of the trend of events in the world crisis, this also has to be closely followed. So, we must find out how we approach this problem, whether as a

personal loss, or as an indication of the whole catastrophe that is taking place in the world. Now, if it is an identified personal loss, then it has quite a different significance. There is in all of us the tendency to identify ourselves with something greater, whether it is a nation, a person, an idea, an image, a thought, or a superior consciousness; because, it is so much more satisfying to be identified with a group, with a nation, or with a person representing the nation - Hitler or Stalin on the one side, and Gandhiji on the other, and so on. So, there is identification with something greater; and when anything happens to that person, or to that idea, or to that group or nation, there is a shattering of that response. Aren't you feeling it, Sir? The desire to identify ourselves with something is obvious, is it not? Because, in oneself one is nothing, empty, shallow, petty; and by identifying oneself with a country, with a leader, with a group, one becomes something, one is something. In this very identification lies the danger; because, if you are aware of it, you will see that it leads to the most extraordinary barbarities in history, in our daily life. That is, if you identify yourself with a country, with a community, with a group of people, with an idea, with the communalistic spirit, then, surely, you are responsible for any calamity that happens; because, if you are merely an instrument which identifies itself with some cause or some person, then you are being used, and the calamity, the crisis, the catastrophe, is created by that very identification.

So, that is one side of the problem; and the question should be really, what are the contributory causes which I have created to bring about this incident, this misery, this catastrophe?'. Surely, that is the real question, is it not? Because, we are individually



responsible for everything that is happening in the world at the present time. World events are not unrelated incidents: they are related. The real cause of Gandhiji's untimely death lies in you. The real cause is you. Because you are communalistic, you encourage the spirit of division through property, through caste, through ideology, through having different religions, sects, leaders. So, obviously, you are responsible, aren't you? And it is no good merely hanging one man - you have all contributed to that death. The question is, in what way have you contributed to it? I am purposely not including myself in it, because I am not a communalist, I am not Hindu or Indian, I am not nationalistic or internationalistic. Therefore, I am excluding myself from it, not because I am superior, but because I do not think in those terms at all - of belonging to one group or to one religion, of having property which is 'mine'. I am deliberately, consciously excluding myself - please understand that it is not because I feel myself to be superior to others. Identification with a group, with a nation, with a community, with property, does lead to misery, does it not? Such identification obviously leads to murders, to disasters, to chaos, and you are responsible for it, because you do believe in Hinduism with its many different facets, which are all absurd. You are either a Hindu, a Parsee, a Buddhist, or a Mussulman - you know, the whole rot of identified division, isolation. So, since you have identified yourself with a group, you are responsible, aren't you? You are the real cause of this murder. I am not being dramatic, which would be too absurd; but that is the fact, is it not? So, the real cause is you - not some mysterious, unknown cause. When a so-called nation is made up of separate groups, each seeking

power, position, authority, wealth, you are bound to produce, not one man's death, but thousands and millions of deaths - it is inevitable.

So, the fundamental issue really is whether human beings can exist in identified isolation; and history has shown over and over again that it is destruction to man. When you call yourself a Hindu, a Mussulman, a Parsee, or God knows what else, it is bound to produce conflict in the world. If you observe so-called religion, organized religion, you will see that it is essentially based on isolation, separatism: the Christian, the Hindu, the Mussulman, the Buddhist; and when you worship an image or no image, when you prevent somebody from going into your temples - as if reality lies in the temple! - , surely you are responsible for conflict and violence, aren't you? Please, I am not haranguing, I am not interested in convincing you; but we are both interested in finding the truth of the matter. So, this is not just a political harangue, which has no meaning at all. To find the truth, to see that we are responsible for what happens, we must think very closely, directly. When you have a religion to which you belong, an organized religion, that very fact creates conflict between man and man; and when belief becomes stronger than affection, stronger than love, when belief is more important than humanity and your whole make-up is one of belief - whether belief in God or in an ideology, in communalism or in nationalism - , obviously you are the very cause of destruction. I do not know if you feel the extra, ordinary importance of all this - or thinking it out very clearly and not hiding behind words. Then there is the obvious fact of division through property, through the sense of acquisitiveness. Property in

itself has very little meaning: you can sleep in only one room, one bed; but the desire for position, the urge to acquire, to make yourself secure when everybody around you is insecure - surely, this sense of acquisitiveness, this sense of ownership, this sense of possession, is one of the causes of the appalling misery in the world. It is not that you must give up property, but let us be aware of its significance, of its meaning in action; and when one is aware of it, one naturally gives up all these things. It is not difficult to renounce, it is not a travail to give up property, when you see directly that your relationship with property leads to misery, not for one person, but for millions; and that you are fighting over property.

These are not just words, if you analyze them - property and belief really are the two chief causes of conflict. Property as a means of personal aggrandizement, property as a means of permanent self-continuity, gives you position, power, prestige. Without property you are nothing, obviously; therefore, property becomes extraordinarily important, for which you are prepared to kill, maim, destroy people. Similarly with organized religions and political ideologies, implying belief. Belief becomes very important - because, without belief, where are you? Without calling yourself by a communalistic, isolating name, where are you? You are lost, aren't you? So, because you feel the threat to yourself, you identify yourself with property, with belief, with ideologies, and so on, which inevitably breeds destruction. In how many different ways you try to isolate yourselves from others! This isolation is the real cause of conflict and violence. So, you are responsible, Sirs - and Ladies, with your beautiful saris and

fashionable skirts.

This event has also a world significance. We justify and have accepted evil as a means to good. War is justified because we say it is going to bring us peace - which is obviously using a wrong means to produce a right end. But the trend of the world is in that direction; groups of people, whole nations, are preparing for the ultimate in destruction - as if they were going to be peaceful at the end of it. This event is really an indication, is it not?, of the tendency of human beings to sacrifice the present for the future. We are going to create a marvellous world, but in the meantime we are going to butcher you; we are going to liquidate you for the sake of the future. You don't matter; what matters is the idea, the future - whatever that may mean. After all, the future, whether to the left or to the right, is as uncertain to me as it is to you; the future is changeable, liable to be modified, and we are sacrificing the present for an unknown future. That is the greatest form of illusion, isn't it? But that is one of the tendencies of the world - and that is what is taking place now. That is, we have an ideological future for which human beings are sacrificed: to save man we are killing man. And we are caught in that - you are caught in that. You want future security, therefore you are destroying present security. Surely, understanding is only in the present and not in the future. Comprehension is now not tomorrow.

Now, these two extraordinary tendencies that are prevalent in the world at the present time, indicate, do they not?, an utter lack of love - not a mysterious love of the Supreme and all that rot, but ordinary love between two human beings. You know, one notices as one travels across the world an utter lack of the sense of love in

human beings. There are plenty of sensations, sexual, intellectual, or environmental sensations, but actual affection for somebody, loving somebody with your whole being - that does not exist, for the obvious reason that you have cultivated intellect. You are marvellous at passing examinations, spinning out theories, speculating on the market, making money - which are all indications of the supremacy of the intellect. And when the intellect becomes supreme, you are bound to have disaster, because the heart is empty; so you fill it with words and the fabrications of the intellect. That is what one notices to an extraordinary extent in the world at the present time. Aren't you full of theories, either of the left or of the right, as to how to solve the problem of the world? But your heart is empty, isn't it? And surely the problem is very simple, if you actually look at it. As long as you are identified with property, with name, with caste, with a particular government, community, ideology, belief, you are bound to create destruction and misery in the world. So, it is you who are the real cause of his murder; it is you who have brought about this killing of man by man. You accept organized murder on a grand scale as a fair means during war, but when it is done to one person, you are horrified. Is it not true, Sir, that you as an individual have lost all sensitivity, all sense of real values and of the significance of existence? To understand this question, we have to transform ourselves radically, because that is what is needed to revolutionize absolutely our ways of thinking and feeling and acting. You want to bring about a revolution merely in action, which has no meaning at all; because without a revolution in you and in your feeling, you cannot produce a revolution in action; you cannot produce a revolution

except individually. Since you are responsible, since you are the cause of this murder, and to prevent future murders, you yourself have to change radically, haven't you?, and not talk about gods and theories, karma and reincarnation; you have to be actually aware of what is taking place within yourself. And since it is extremely difficult and arduous to be aware, you spin out theories, you escape through property, through name and family, and all the rest of the absurdities which bring about destruction. So, since you are responsible for this murder, and for past and future murders, whether of one person or of millions, you have to change. You have to be transformed, not by beginning at a distance, but by beginning very close, by observing the ways of your thinking and feeling and acting every day. Surely, if you are interested, if you are serious-minded, that is the only way to bring about transformation, is it not? But if you are emotionally excited by events, if you have been drugged by political harangues during ever so many years, naturally you will feel little response. But, whether you like it or not, you are responsible for the miseries outside, because in yourself you are miserable, confused, anxious, without love.

Question: Is the third war inevitable?

Krishnamurti: There is no such thing as inevitability, is there? A country, being aware of its own weakness, of its own strength, can say, 'No, we are not going to fight'. It is one of the tendencies of the left to push when there is not much pressure, and to yield when the pressure is too great; so you can always withdraw and wait and organize. There is no inevitability about war, but it looks very much like that because the issues involved are so vast. Ideologies

are at war, the right and the left. There is the ideology which says that matter moves of itself, and the ideology which says that matter is moved, acted upon by the divine idea. On the one side there is the idea of God acting upon matter, and on the other, the idea that matter itself is in movement and producing outside circumstances, and that therefore rigid control of environment is important. I am not discussing the ideologies, whether they are right or wrong. We will go into that question another Sunday. But, these two ideas are diametrically opposed - at least, they think they are opposed. And this brings up a very complex problem; whether the left is not based on the right, is not a continuation of the right; whether every opposite is not the continuation of its own opposite. But when two strong parties are each determined to have position, power, naturally it is going to destroy man, caught in between; and that is what is happening in this country, in your own family. When you dominate your wife or your husband, when you are possessive, when you cling to power in a small circle, aren't you contributing to world chaos? When belief in nationalism dominates you. When your country becomes of supreme importance - which is happening in every nation - , then is not a catastrophe of great destruction inevitable? Surely, Sir, the very existence of an army is an indication of war. It is the function of the general to prepare for war; and when you have developed a weapon like the atomic bomb, where are you going to experiment with it? So, again, war is directly related to us. If you are a nationalist, you are contributing to war. If you have enclosed yourself in property, you are contributing to war. If nationalism, communalism, if your own country or your own group becomes the most important thing,

obviously you are contributing to war. Our very existence every day is producing war because we have no peace at all. Surely, if there is to be peace in the world, you yourself have to be peaceful. If I want to be peaceful with you, I must be adaptable, I must be considerate, I must not be dominating; but if neither you nor I are adaptable, if we insist on dominating it is bound to produce a catastrophe.

An American lady came to see me a couple of years ago, during the war. She said she lost her son in Italy, and that she had another son aged 16 whom she wanted to save; so, we discussed and talked the thing over. I suggested to her that, to save her son, she had to cease to be an American; she had to cease to be greedy, cease piling up wealth, seeking power, domination, and be morally simple - not merely simple in clothes, in outward things, but simple in her thoughts and feelings, in her relationships. She said, "That is too much. You are asking far too much. I cannot do it, because circumstances are too powerful for me to alter". Therefore, she was responsible for the destruction of her son. Circumstances can be controlled by us, because we have created the circumstances. Society is the product of relationship, of yours and mine together. If we change in our relationship, society changes; but merely to rely on legislation, on compulsion, for the transformation of outward society while remaining inwardly corrupt, while continuing inwardly to seek power, position, domination, is to destroy the outward, however carefully and scientifically built. That which is inward is always overcoming the outward.

So, again, Sir, the inevitability or the cessation of war depends upon us, upon you and me. Surely, we can change, can't we? We



can transform ourselves - it is not difficult if we put our minds and hearts into it. But we are too sluggish, we leave it to the other fellow; we want easy ways, undisturbed thoughts, inward security. Desiring inward security, we seek it through outward things, through property, belief, temples, churches, mosques. When you seek inward security, you create insecurity. By the very desire to be psychologically secure, you create destruction. That is obvious - it is being repeated in history over and over again. Outward security is essential - food, clothing and shelter. But Man wants to be psychologically secure; so he uses food, clothing, shelter, and ideas, as a means of psychological security - and therefore brings destruction. So, it is again up to you and me to prevent what seems to be inevitable. Wars are inevitable as long as individual human beings are in conflict with each other, which is an indication that they are in conflict within themselves. We want transformation through legislation, through outward revolution, through systems, but yet we are inwardly untransformed. Inwardly we are disturbed, we are confused; and without bringing order, peace and happiness inwardly, we cannot have peace and happiness outwardly in the world.

Question: Can we realize on the spot the truth that you are speaking of, without any previous preparation?

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by truth? Do not let us use a word of which we do not know the meaning; but we can use a simpler word, a more direct word. Can you understand, can you comprehend a problem directly? That is what is implied, is it not? Can you understand what is immediately, now? Because, in understanding what is, you will understand the significance of

truth; but to say that one must understand truth, has very little meaning. So, can you understand a problem directly, fully, and be free of it? That is what is implied in this question, is it not? Can you understand a crisis, a challenge, immediately, see its whole significance and be free of it. Because, what you understand leaves no mark; therefore, understanding, or truth, is the liberator. And can you be liberated now from a problem, from a challenge? Life is, is it not?, a series of challenges and responses; and if your response to a challenge is conditioned, limited, incomplete, then that challenge leaves its mark, its residue, which is further strengthened by another new challenge. So, there is constant residual memory, accumulations, scars; and with all these scars, you try to meet the new, and therefore you never meet the new. Therefore you never understand, there is never a liberation from any challenge. I hope I am making myself clear.

So, the problem, the question is, whether I can understand a challenge completely, directly, sense all its significance, all its perfume, its depth, its beauty and its ugliness, and so be free of it. Sir, challenge is always new, is it not? The problem is always new, is it not? The problem is always new - a question like this is always new. I do not know if you follow that. A problem which you had yesterday, for example, has undergone such modification that when you meet it today, it is already new. But you meet it with the old, because you meet it without transforming, modifying your own thoughts.

Let me put it in a different way. I met you yesterday. In the meantime, you have changed. You have undergone a modification, but I still have yesterday's picture of you. So, I meet you today

with my picture of you, and therefore I do not understand you - I understand only the picture of you, which I acquired yesterday. Sir, if I want to understand you who are modified, changed, I must remove, I must be free of the picture of yesterday. That is, to understand a challenge, which is always new, I must also meet it anew, there must be no residue of yesterday; so, I must say adieu to yesterday. After all, what is life? It is something new all the time, is it not? It is something which is ever undergoing change, creating a new feeling. Today is never the same as yesterday, and that is the beauty of life. So, can I, can you, meet any problem anew? Can you, when you go home, meet your wife and your child anew, meet the challenge anew? You will not be able to do it if you are burdened with the memories of yesterday. Therefore, to understand the truth of a problem, of a relationship, you must come to it afresh - not with an 'open mind', for that has no meaning. You must come to it without the scars of yesterday's memories - which means, as each challenge arises, be aware of all the responses of yesterday; and by being aware of yesterday's residue, memories, you will find that they drop away without struggle, and therefore your mind is fresh.

So, can one realize truth immediately, without preparation? I say yes - not out of some fancy of mine, not out of some illusion; but psychologically experiment with it, and you will see. Take any challenge, any small incident - don't wait for some great crisis - , and see how you respond to it. Be aware of it, of your responses, of your intentions, of your attitudes, and you will understand them, you will understand your background. I assure you, you can do it immediately if you give your whole attention to it. That is, if you

are seeking the full meaning of your background, it yields its significance; and then you discover in one stroke the truth, the understanding of the problem. Surely, understanding comes into being from the now, the present, which is always timeless. Though it may be tomorrow, it is still the now; and merely to postpone, to prepare to receive that which is tomorrow, is to prevent yourself from understanding what is now. Surely, you can understand directly what is now, can't you? But to understand what is, you have to be undisturbed, undistracted, you have to give your mind and heart to it. It must be your sole interest at that moment, completely. Then what is gives you its full depth, its full meaning; and thereby you are free of that problem.

Sir, if you want to know the truth, the significance, the psychological significance of property, if you really want to understand it directly, now, how do you approach it? Surely, you must feel akin to the problem, you must not be afraid of it, you must not have any creed, any answer between yourself and the problem. Only when you are directly in relationship with the problem, then you will find the answer. But if you introduce an answer, if you judge, have a psychological disinclination, then you will postpone, you will prepare to understand tomorrow what is always there. Therefore you will never understand. So, to perceive truth needs no preparation; preparation implies time, and time is not the means of understanding truth. Time is continuity, and truth is timeless, it is non-continuous. Understanding is non-continuous, it is from moment to moment, unresidual.

I am afraid I am making it all very difficult, am I not? It is easy, simple to understand, if you will experiment with it; but if you go

into a dream, meditate over it, it becomes very difficult. Surely, when there is no barrier between you and me, I understand you. If I am open to you, I understand you directly' - and to be open is not a matter of time. Will time make me open? Will preparation, system, discipline, make me open to you? No, sir. What will make me open to you is my intention to be open, I want to be open because I have nothing to hide, I am not afraid; therefore I am open, and therefore there is instant communion, there is truth. To receive truth, to know its beauty, to know its joy, there must be instant receptivity, unclouded by theories, fears and answers.

It is quarter past seven. Shall I go on? Yes?

Question: Does Gandhiji continue to exist today?

Krishnamurti: Do you really want to know? Yes? What is implied in this question? If he continues to live, then you also will continue to live; so, you want to know the truth of continuity. If I die, will I continue? Will I have a being, or will I be destroyed altogether? Now, Sirs, probably most of you believe in reincarnation, in continuity. Therefore, your belief is preventing you from finding the truth of this question. You understand? Here is a challenge. We are going to experiment with what I said in answer to the previous question. We are going to experiment, to find out the truth of this matter - directly, not tomorrow. To understand directly, you must put away your belief in reincarnation, mustn't you? You do not know, it is only a belief. Even though you may think you have proof of continuity, it is still in the field of thought. Mind can deceive itself and fabricate anything it wishes. So, we want to find the truth of this challenge, and to find the truth of it, we must come to it afresh, with a new

mind; because, to understand now, not tomorrow, a new mind, a fresh mind, is necessary.

Now, in order to find the truth, I must discover what is preventing the mind from being fresh. I am not answering whether Gandhiji lives or not - we will come to that later. But to understand, there must be freshness. So, I am going to find out if my mind is clouded. As I am full of anxiety, full of hope, full of desire for continuity, I am obviously clouded; therefore, I cannot comprehend the new challenge, 'Is there continuity?'. To understand it now, immediately, I must understand the various blockades that are preventing the mind from being fresh, new, so that it receives the new. Now, what is continuity? Are you interested in all this, Sirs, or are you merely listening? For the moment, forget that you are merely listening, and experiment with me as I go along, I am thinking aloud with you about this problem. It is your problem as well as mine - I am only giving expression to it. It is your problem, so follow it, experiment with it step by step.

Now, what is it that we call continuity? What is it that continues? It is either one of two things: Either it is a spiritual entity, and therefore beyond time, or it is merely memory, giving itself continuity through the residue of experience. Do you follow? Am I making myself clear? That is, if I am a spiritual entity, then I am timeless; therefore there is no continuity. Because, that which is spirituality, truth, godliness, is beyond time; therefore it is not the continuity we know of as tomorrow and the future. Do you follow? If what I am is a spiritual entity. it must be without continuity, it cannot progress, it cannot grow, it cannot become; but actually, what I am thinks that it must become, that is, I am thinking in

terms of becoming. Therefore I am not a spiritual entity. Because, if I am a spiritual entity, I am not becoming; then death and life are one, then there is timelessness, there is eternity. But you are thinking in terms of becoming, therefore you are caught in time. Don't go to sleep over this - we are experimenting together.

So, if you are a spiritual entity, then you don't have to bother about it, then you don't have to find out if there is continuity or not. It is finished - there is deathlessness. But you are not that; you are afraid, and that is why you want to know if there is continuity. So, you are left with only one thing, which is memory. Do you follow, Sirs? You cannot quibble between the two. If you are a spiritual entity, then you are not concerned about death, about continuity, about time; because, that which is spiritual is eternal, timeless. But you are not in that state of being. You are in the state of becoming, in the state of continuing, wanting to know if there is continuity or not. This very question indicates that you are not in the other state of being - therefore we can leave it alone. So, what is it that continues? What is it that continues in your daily life? Obviously, not the spiritual entity. It is your memory identified with property, name, relationship and ideas, is it not? If you had no memory, property would have no meaning. If you had no memory of yesterday, property would have no meaning whatsoever, nor would relationship, nor would ideas. You are seeking continuity and establishing it through property, through family, through idea, which is the 'I', and you want to know if the 'I' continues. Now, when you talk of the 'I', what is it? It is name, qualities, ideas, your bank account, your position, character, ideation - which is all memory, isn't it? Sir, I am not pushing you to accept anything. I am

stating what actually is, not dealing with theories or speculations. We are experimenting to see if we can find the truth of the question and be liberated from the problem of continuity.

So, what causes continuity? Obviously, memory. How does memory come into being? Very simply: There is perception, contact, sensation, desire, and identification. I perceive a car, there is the perception of a car; then there is contact, then sensation, then the desire to own, and then it is 'mine'. So, the 'I' is the residue of memory; however much it is divided, as the higher self, and the lower self, it is still within the field of memory - which is obvious, whether you accept it or not. When you think of God, it is still in the field of memory. When you talk of the higher self, when you talk about Brahman, it is still within the field of memory; and memory is incomplete understanding. That is, have you not noticed that when you understand a thing, it leaves no scar of memory? That is why love is not memory. Love is a state of being, it is not a continuity. It becomes continuity only when there is no love. So, there is no continuity if there is no memory. That is, thought identified must continue; but if there is no identification, there is no continuity, and memory is the very basis of identification. Through continuity, is there ever renewal? Do you understand? The 'I' continues from memory to memory - the memory of my achievements, my faculties, my properties, my family, my ideation, my thoughts, and so on. All that is the 'I', the self, whether a higher or a lower self. That is the 'I'. Now, will that continuity ever bring a renewal, a rebirth, a freshness, a newness? Will continuity bring the understanding of truth? Surely not. That which continues has no renewal, has no freshness, no newness, because it is merely



continuing in a modified form that which was yesterday. It is memory, and memory is not a process of renewal. There is no renewal through memory, through continuity - there is renewal only when there is an ending, there is freshness only when there is a death, when idea ceases. Then each day there is renewal, When 'I' ceases to be each day, each minute, there is renewal. Where there is continuity, there is no renewal; and it is continuity that we are all craving. This question as to whether Gandhiji continues means really, 'Do I continue?' - 'I', identified with him. You will continue, obviously, as long as there is identification, because memory continues; but in that there is no renewal. Memory is time, and time is not the door to reality; through time, you can never come to the timeless. Therefore, there must be an ending, which means that in order to find the real there must be death every minute, death to your possessions, to your position, not to love. Obviously, there is continuity when thought is identified. But continuity can never lead to the real, because continuity is merely thought identified as the 'I' which is memory; and there is renewal, rebirth, freshness, newness, a timeless state of being, only when there is a death, an ending, from moment to moment. Truth, reality, God, or what you will, does not come into being through the process of time. It comes into being only when time, when memory, ceases. When you as memory are absent, when you as memory function not, when that activity as the 'I' ceases, then there is an ending. In that ending, there is renewal; and in that renewal there is reality.

February 1, 1948

## **BOMBAY 4TH PUBLIC TALK 8TH FEBRUARY, 1948**

I think it is important to understand that there is being, only when there is no longer the thinker, and it is only in being that there can be radical transformation. Ideas cannot transform; the modification of thoughts cannot bring about revolution, radical revolution. There can be radical revolution only when the thinker comes to a standstill, when the thinker ends, When do you have creative moments, a sense of joy, a sense of beauty? Surely, only when the thinker is absent, when the thought process ceases for a second, for a minute, for a period of time; then, in that space, there is creative joy. That is real revolution, because then the thinker ceases, and thereby there is a possibility of radical transformation, radical rebirth. So, our problem is how to bring about an end to the thinker - it is not a matter of the transformation, the modification of ideas, either of the left or of the right. Only in bringing the thinker to an end is there creativeness. Perhaps you have experienced that while watching a sunset, when there is great beauty: the intensity of it drives the thinker away, and within that moment there is an extraordinary sense of joy. That creative moment brings revolution, which is a state of being. The thinker ceases, not as a result of transforming thoughts, but only by understanding the movements of the thinker and therefore coming to the central issue, the problem itself, which is the thinker. When the thinker is aware of his own movements, when the mind is aware of itself in action - which is not the thinker altering thoughts, but the thinker being aware of himself - , then you will find there comes a period when

the mind is absolutely still, when it is meditative, when it is not attracted, not agitated. Then, in that moment, when the thinker is silent, there comes creative being which, if you will experiment, you will find is the foundation of all radical transformation.

Now I am going to answer several questions.

Question: Can one love truth without loving man? Can one love man without loving truth? Which comes first?

Krishnamurti: Surely, Sir, love comes first. Because, to love truth, you must know truth; and to know truth is to deny it. What is known is not truth, because what is known is already encased in time; therefore, it ceases to be truth. Truth is in constant movement and therefore cannot be measured in time or in words; it cannot be held in your fist. So, to love truth is to know truth - you cannot love something that you do not know. But truth is not to be found in books, in idolatry, in temples. It is to be found in action, in living, in thinking; and since love comes first, which is obvious, the very search for the unknown is love itself, and you cannot search for the unknown without being in relationship with others. You cannot seek out reality, God, or what you will, by withdrawing into isolation. You can find the unknown only in relationship, only when man is related to man. Therefore, the love of man is the search for reality. Without loving man, without loving humanity, there cannot be search for the real; because, when I know you, at least when I try to know you in relationship, in that relationship I am beginning to know myself. Relationship is a mirror in which I am discovering myself - not my higher self, but the whole, total process of myself. The higher self and the lower self are still within the field of the mind; and without

understanding the mind, the thinker, how can I go beyond thought and discover? The very relationship is the search for the real, because that is the only contact I have with myself; therefore, the understanding of myself in relationship is the beginning of life, surely. If I do not know how to love you, you with whom I am in relationship, how can I search for the real and therefore love the real? Without you, I am not, am I? I cannot exist apart from you, I cannot be in isolation. Therefore, in our relationship, in the relationship between you and me, I am beginning to understand myself; and the understanding of myself is the beginning of wisdom, is it not? Therefore, the search for the real is the beginning of love in relationship. To love something, you must know it, you must understand it, mustn't you? To love you, I must know you, I must enquire, I must find out, I must be receptive to all your moods, your changes, and not merely enclose myself in my ambitions, pursuits and desires; and in knowing you, I am beginning to discover myself. Without you, I cannot be; and if I do not understand that relationship between you and me, how can there be love? And surely, without love there is no search, is there? You cannot say that one must love truth; because, to love truth, you must know truth. Do you know truth? Do you know what reality is? The moment you know something, it is already over, is it not? It is already in the field of time, therefore it ceases to be truth.

So, our problem is, how can a dry heart, an empty heart, know truth? It cannot. Truth, sir, is not something distant. It is very near, but we do not know how to look for it. To look for it, we must understand relationship, not only with man but with nature, with ideas; I must understand my relationship with the earth, and my

relationship with ideation, as well as my relationship with you; and in order to understand, surely there must be openness. If I want to understand you, I must be open to you, I must be receptive, I must not withhold anything - there cannot be an isolating process.

Therefore, in understanding there is truth and to understand there must be love; for without love, there cannot be understanding. So, it is not man or truth that comes first, but love; and love comes into being only in understanding relationship, which means that one is open to relationship, and therefore open to reality. Truth cannot be invited - it must come to you. To search for truth, is to deny truth. Truth comes to you when you are open, when you are completely without a barrier, when the thinker is no longer thinking; producing, manufacturing, when the mind is very still - not forced, not drugged, not mesmerized by words, by repetition. Truth must come; and when the thinker goes after truth, he is merely pursuing his own gain. Therefore, truth eludes him. The thinker can be observed only in relationship; and to understand, there must be love. Without love, there is no search.

Question: You cannot build a new world in the way you are doing it now. It is obvious that the method of training laboriously a few chosen disciples will not make any difference to humanity. It cannot. You may be able to leave a mark like Gandhiji, Mohammed, Buddha, Krishna, have done. But, they have not fundamentally changed the world - nor will you, unless you discover an entirely new way of approach to the problem.

Krishnamurti: Let us think it out together. The question implies, does it not?, that the wave of destruction, the wave of confusion, is co-existent with life; that the wave of destruction, and life, are

always together, running together simultaneously, and there is no interval between them. So, the questioner says, 'You may have a few disciples who understand, a few who really perceive and transform themselves, but they cannot transform the world'. And that is the problem: That man should be transformed, not just a few. Christ, Buddha, and others have not transformed the world, because the wave of destruction is always sweeping over mankind; and the questioner says, 'Have you a different way of solving this problem? If not, you will be like the rest of the teachers. A few may come out of the chaos, the confusion, but the majority will be swallowed up, destroyed'. You understand the problem, don't you? That is, the few who escape from the burning house hope to draw others from the fire; but since the vast majority are doomed to burn, many who are burning invent the theory of the process of time: in the next life it will be alright. So, they look to time as a means of transformation. That is the problem, is it not? A few of us may be out of this chaos, but the vast majority are held in the net of time, in the net of becoming, in the net of sorrow; and can they be transformed? Can they leave the burning house instantaneously, completely? If not, the wave of confusion, the wave of misery, is continuously covering them up, continuously destroying them. That is the problem, isn't it? I am only explaining, studying the question. So, is there a new approach to the problem? Otherwise, only a few can be saved - which means the wave of destruction, the wave of confusion, is always pursuing man. That is the problem, isn't it, Sirs?

Now, let us try to find the truth of it. Is it not possible for us to step out of time - all of us here, not by some self-hypnotic process,

but actually? That is the problem involved. Can you and I, can you who are listening to me, step out of the process of time, so that you are free from chaos? Because, as long as you believe in that process, that is, as long as you say you are becoming free from chaos through the process of time, you and chaos are always co-existent. I do not know if I am explaining myself. That is, if you think that you will become free from chaos, you will never be free, because the becoming is part of the chaos. Either we understand now, or never. If you say, 'I will understand tomorrow', you are really postponing; you are really inviting the wave of destruction. So, our problem is to put an end to the becoming process, and therefore put an end to time. As long as you think in terms of becoming - 'I will be good', 'I will be noble', 'I will be something tomorrow which I am not today' - , in that becoming is implied the time process, and in the time process there is confusion. So, there is confusion because you are thinking in terms of becoming. Now, instead of becoming, can you be? - in which alone there is transformation, radical transformation. Becoming is a process of time, being is free from time. And, as I explained earlier, only in being can there be transformation, not in becoming; only in ending is there renewal, not in continuity. Continuity is becoming. When you end something, there is a being; and it is only in being, that there can be fundamental, radical transformation.

So, our problem is to put an end to becoming - not chronological becoming, as yesterday became today and today becomes tomorrow, but - , psychological becoming. Can you put an end instantaneously to that becoming? That is the only new approach, is it not? Every other way is the old approach. Do you

understand the question? At present, all forms of approach are gradual. I am this, but I will become that tomorrow; I am a clerk, but I will be the manager in ten years' time; I am angry, but I will slowly become virtuous. That is becoming, which is the process of time; and where there is time, there must be the wave of confusion also. So, our problem is, can we immediately and altogether stop thinking in terms of becoming? That is the only new approach otherwise, we repeat the old approach. I say it is possible. I say you can do it, you can cease to be caught in the net of time, in the net of becoming, you can cease to think in terms of time, in terms of the future, in terms of yesterday. You can do it, and you are doing it now; you do it when you are tremendously interested, when the thought process ceases entirely, when there is complete concentration, complete awareness. That is, Sirs, you do it when you are face to face with a new problem. Now, this is a new problem - how to bring time to an end. As it is a new problem, you must be completely new in regard to it, must you not? Because, if you think in terms of the old, surely you are then translating the new problem into the old and therefore confusing, misinterpreting the problem. When it is a new problem, you must come to it anew; and that which is new is timeless.

So, the point is this: Can you, as you are now sitting here listening to me, free yourself from time? Can you be aware of that state of being in which there is no time? If you are aware of that state of being, you will see that there is a tremendous revolution taking place instantaneously, because the thinker has ceased. It is the thinker that produces the process of becoming. So, time can be brought to an end, time has a stop - not chronological time, but



psychological time. Now, look: Many of you are gazing at somebody else - you are more interested in seeing who is coming and who is going. Therefore, what has happened? You are not interested to discover what it is to be without time; and you can discover what it is to be free from the net of time only when you give your whole mind and heart to it, your whole attention - not the attention which is merely exclusive. That, surely, is right meditation, is it not? For thought to end is the beginning of real meditation; and then only is there a revolution, a fundamentally new approach to existence. The new approach is to bring time to an end; and I say it can be done instantaneously, if you are interested. You can step from the river onto the shore at any point. The river of becoming ceases when you understand the time process; but to understand, you must give your heart and mind to it. You are free of time only when there is complete absorption in understanding, - which you are doing now. You are very quiet. You are quiet, because we are discussing, we are forcing the issue. But you cease to be quiet the moment the issue disappears. If you maintain, if you keep that issue clearly in front of you all the time, the stepping out of time becomes an extraordinarily absorbing problem; and I say that for any who are willing to give their mind and heart to it, it is possible to step out of time. That is the only new approach, and therefore it can bring about a radical transformation in society.

Question: When I listen to you, all seems clear and new. At home, the old, dull restlessness asserts itself. What is wrong with me?

Krishnamurti: What is actually taking place in our lives? There is constant challenge and response. That is existence, that is life, is

it not? - a constant challenge and response. The challenge is always new, and the response is always old. I met you yesterday, and you come to me today. You are transformed, you are modified, you have changed, you are new; but I have the picture of you as you were yesterday. Therefore, I absorb the new into the old. I don't meet you anew, but I have yesterday's picture of you; so, my response to challenge is always conditioned. Here, for the moment, you cease to be a Brahmin, you cease to be high-caste, or whatever it is - you forget everything. You are just listening, absorbed, trying to find out. But, when you go out of this place, you become yourself - you are back in your caste, your system, your job, your family. That is, the new is always being absorbed into the old, into the old habits, customs, ideas, traditions, memories. There is never the new, for you are always meeting the new with the old - the challenge is new, but you meet it with the old. So, the problem in this question is, how to free thought from the old, so as to be new all the time? When you see a flower, when you see a face, when you see the sky, when you see a tree, when you see a car, when you see a smile, how are you to meet it anew? Why is it that we do not meet it anew? Why is it that the old absorbs the new, and modifies it; why does the new cease when you go home?

Now, the old response arises from the thinker. Is not the thinker always the old? Because your thought is founded on the past, when you meet the new it is the thinker who is meeting it; the experience of yesterday is meeting it. The thinker is always the old. So, we come back to the same problem in a different way: How to free the mind from itself as the thinker? How to eradicate memory, not factual memory, but psychological memory, which is the

accumulation of experience? Because, without freedom from the residue of experience, there can be no reception of the new. Now, to free thought, to be free of the thought process and so to meet the new, is arduous, is it not? Because, all our beliefs, all our traditions, all our methods in education, are a process of imitation, copying, memorizing, building up the reservoir of memory. That memory is constantly responding to the new; the response of that memory we call thinking, and that thinking meets the new. So, how can there be the new? Only when there is no residue of memory can there be newness, and there is residue when experience is not finished, concluded, ended, that is, when the understanding of experience is incomplete. When experience is complete, there is no residue - that is the beauty of life. Love is not residue, love is not experience, it is a state of being. Love is eternally new. So, our problem is: Can one meet the new constantly, even at home? Surely, one can. To do that, one must bring about a revolution in thought, in feeling; and you can be free only when every incident is thought out from moment to moment, when every response is fully understood, not merely casually looked at and thrown aside. There is freedom from accumulating memory only when every thought, every feeling is completed, thought out to the end. That is, when each thought and each feeling is thought out, concluded, there is an ending; and there is a space between that ending and the next thought. In that space of silence, there is renewal, the new creativeness takes place. Now, this is not theoretical, this is not impractical. If you will try to think out every thought and every feeling, you will discover that it is extraordinarily practical in your daily life; for then you are new, and what is new is eternal,

enduring. To be new is creative, and to be creative is to be happy; and a happy man is not concerned whether he is rich or poor, he does not care to what caste he belongs, or to what country. He has no leaders, no gods, no temples, and therefore no quarrels, no enmity. Surely, that is the most practical way of solving our difficulties in this present world chaos. It is because we are not creative, in the sense in which I am using that word, that we are so antisocial at all the different levels of our consciousness, To be very practical and effective in our social relationship, in our relationship with everything, one must be happy; and there cannot be happiness if there is no ending, there cannot be happiness if there is a becoming. In ending there is renewal, rebirth, a newness, a freshness, a joy. But the new is absorbed into the old, and the old destroys the new, as long as there is background, as long as the mind, the thinker, is conditioned by his thought. To be free from the background, from the conditioning influences, from memory, there must be freedom from continuity; and, there is continuity as long as thought and feeling are not ended completely. Sir, you complete a thought when you pursue the thought to its end, and thereby bring an end to every thought, to every feeling. Surely, love is not habit, memory; love is always new. There can be a meeting of the new only when the mind is fresh; and the mind is not fresh as long as there is the residue of memory. Memory is factual, as well as psychological. I am not talking of factual memory, but of psychological memory. As long as experience is not completely understood, there is residue, which is the old, which is of yesterday, the thing that is past; and the past is always absorbing the new and therefore destroying the new. It is only

when the mind is free from the old that it meets everything anew, and in that there is joy.

Question: You never mention God, Has he no place in your teachings?

Krishnamurti: You talk a great deal about God, don't you? Your books are full of it. You build churches, temples, you make sacrifices, you do rituals, perform ceremonies, and you are full of ideas about God, are you not? You repeat the word, but your acts are not godly, are they? Though you worship what you call God, your ways, your thoughts, your existence, are not godly, are they? Though you repeat the word `God', you exploit others, do you not? You have your gods - Hindu, Mussulman, Christian, and all the rest of it. You build temples; and the richer you get, the more temples you build. (Laughter.) Don't laugh, Sir, you would do the same yourself - only you are still trying to become rich, that is all. So, you are very familiar with God, at least with the word; but the word is not God, the word is not the thing. So, let us be very clear on that point: The word is not God. You may use the word `God' or some other word, but God is not the word which you use. Because you use it, it does not mean that you know God; you merely know the word. I don't use that word for the very simple reason that you know it. What you know is not the real. And besides, to find reality, all verbal mutterings of the mind must cease, must they not? You have images of God, but the image is not God, surely. How can you know God? Obviously, not through an image, not through a temple. To receive God, the unknown, the mind must be the unknown. If you pursue God, then you already know God, you know the end; you know what you are pursuing, don't you? If you

seek God, you must know what God is; otherwise, you wouldn't seek him, would you? You seek him either according to your books, or according to your feelings; and your feelings are merely the response of memory. Therefore, that which you seek is already created, either through memory or through hearsay, and that which is created is not the eternal - it is the product of the mind. Sirs if there were no books, if there were no gurus, no formulas to be repeated you would only know sorrow and happiness, wouldn't you? - constant sorrow and misery, and rare moments of happiness; and then you would want to know why you suffer. You couldn't escape to God - but you would probably escape in other ways, and soon invent gods as an escape. But, if you really want to understand the whole process of suffering, as a new man; a fresh man, enquiring and not escaping, then you will free yourself from sorrow, then you will find out what reality is, what God is. But a man in sorrow cannot find God or reality; reality can be found only when sorrow ceases, when there is happiness, not as a contrast, not as an opposite, but that state of being in which there are no opposites.

So, the unknown, that which is not created by the mind, cannot be formulated by the mind. That which is unknown cannot be thought about. The moment you think about the unknown, it is already the known. Surely you cannot think about the unknown, can you? You can think only about the known. Thought moves from the known to the known; and what is known is not reality, is it? So, when you think and meditate, when you sit down and think about God, you only think about what is known, and what is known is in time; it is caught in the net of time, and is therefore not

the real. Reality can come into being only when the mind is free from the net of time. When the mind ceases to create, there is creation. That is, the mind must be absolutely still, but not with an induced, a hypnotized stillness, which is merely a result. Trying to become still in order to experience reality is another form of escape. There is silence only when all problems have ceased; as the pool is quiet when the breeze stops, so the mind is naturally quiet when the agitator, the thinker, ceases. To put an end to the thinker, all the thoughts which he manufactures must be thought out. It is no good erecting a barrier, a resistance, against thought; because, thoughts must be felt out, the mind is still, reality, the indescribable, comes into being. You cannot invite it. To invite it, you must know it, and what is known is not the real. So, the mind must be simple, unburdened by belief, by ideation; and when there is stillness, when there is no desire, no longing, when the mind is absolutely quiet with a stillness that is not induced, then reality comes. And that truth, that reality, is the only transforming agent; it is the only factor that brings a fundamental, radical revolution in existence, in our daily life. And to find that reality is not to seek it, but to understand the factors that agitate the mind, that disturb the mind itself. Then the mind is simple, quiet, still. In that stillness the unknown, the unknowable, comes into being; and when that happens, there is a blessing.

February 8, 1928

## **BOMBAY 5TH PUBLIC TALK 15TH FEBRUARY, 1948**

Each Sunday I have been trying to take up a different subject and approach the problem of existence from a different point of view. I am going to try this evening to approach it from the point of view of effort, this constant battle that we make to overcome something, to succeed, to achieve, and see if we can have a brief period to comprehend the full significance of this struggle. There is so much sorrow and so little happiness in our lives. When there is happiness, the problems of power, position, and achievement, come to an end. When there is happiness, the struggle to become ceases, and the divisions between man and man are broken down. We must often have noticed, in those rare moments when we are perfectly happy, quiet, that all conflicts cease to exist. So, happiness comes only with the highest form of intelligence. Intelligence is the understanding of sorrow. We know sorrow, it is always with us, a constant companion; it seems to be without end - sorrow in different forms, at different levels, physical and psychological. We know certain remedies to overcome physical pain; but psychologically it is much more difficult. The psychological problem is much more complex, demanding greater attention and greater study, deeper penetration and wider experience; but sorrow, wherever it be, at whatever level, is still painful.

So, the problem is: Does sorrow, suffering, come to an end through effort, through a thought process? You understand, I am not for the moment talking about the physiological suffering, the



painful disease, but about the psychological suffering. Does that suffering come to an end through effort, through what we call the thought process? Physical pain can be overcome by effort, by searching out the causes of disease. But psychological suffering, pain, anxiety, frustration, the innumerable aches - can they be overcome by effort, by thought. So we have first to enquire what is suffering, what is effort, and what is thought. It is a very large problem to be solved in a very short time; but if you will follow it attentively, I think it is possible to understand the significance of it; and perhaps in understanding it directly we shall be able to solve it, or rather catch a momentary glimpse of that happiness which destroys this ache, this burning loneliness and pain.

So, what is suffering? Is it not the desire to become, with its varying frustrations? Is not sorrow the outcome of the desire to be other than what one is? Do not actions based on that desire lead to disintegration, to conflict, to the neverending wave of confusion? So, sorrow, suffering, is the desire to become, the desire to be, either positively or negatively. I think we can all agree on that fundamentally. Sorrow comes into being when there is the desire to become. In that becoming, there is action, whether social action or individual action; and that action is constantly expanding itself in disintegration, in futility, in frustration, which we see about us constantly. Now, can this desire to become, which is the cause of sorrow, come to an end through effort? That is what we try to do, is it not? When we are frustrated, when there is pain, when there is sorrow, we try to overcome it, we try to battle against it. This positive or defensive attack is called effort, is it not? That is, effort exists or comes into being when there is the anxiety to change what

one is. I am this, and I want to become that. This change, this movement of changing this into that, is called effort. Now, what is change, what is changing - not the dictionary meaning, but the inner significance of it? Surely, change is a modified continuity, I am this, and I want to become that; that is, I want to become the opposite of what I am. But the opposite is the continuity of what I am in a different form. So, the opposite, in which there is always effort, is the modified continuity of its own opposite. Non-greed is the modified continuity of greed; it is still greed, only under a different name, because in it becoming is implied, and this becoming, in which effort is involved, is the cause of sorrow. We see that effort implies continuity in a modified form. And can thought, can the thought process, bring sorrow to an end?

Probably this is all rather abstract and difficult, but we will simplify it as I begin to answer questions about it. But I think we will have to lay the abstract before us, and then build structurally, concretely; and we will do that when we understand the principle of this problem of suffering - whether suffering can be overcome through effort which creates the opposite, and whether suffering, which is the desire to become something here or hereafter, can be brought to an end by thought. Now, what is thinking? When you say, 'I am thinking', what does it mean? You are trying to solve the problem of sorrow through thought; and can thought put an end to pain, to psychological anxiety, to fear, and so on? So, what is thinking? Surely, thinking is the response of memory; if you had no memory, you would not be capable of thinking. Memory is the residue of experience - experience which is not completely, fully understood. When you understand something completely, fully, it

leaves no mark. Only the undigested, incomplete experience leaves a mark, which we call memory. So, thinking is the response of memory; and when you try to solve the problem of suffering through thought, thought being the response of memory, surely there is no solution; because memory is the continuity of effort. This is not a cleverly worked out puzzle; but if you think about it, you will see that three things are involved in your process of dealing with pain: effort, thought, and memory. Don't memorize it - watch it operating in your daily life, and you will see. You don't have to read philosophical books; but, if you will watch yourself when there is anxiety, when there is pain, you will see these three things at work. And can these things overcome, dissolve, the pain, the sorrow? Obviously they cannot, because the thought process is merely the outcome of incomplete understanding, and change is merely modified continuity, which creates the opposite. So, our problem is to find out what can put an end to sorrow, what can bring about that state of happiness, which is obviously not the result of effort. I don't know if you have ever tried to be happy. Surely, you have never succeeded when you tried to be happy. Happiness comes into being spontaneously, uninvited. So, it cannot be a result of effort and if we seek happiness by getting rid of sorrow, then we will not understand, put an end to sorrow without the thought process, without effort? Because effort implies, as pointed out, the creating of duality, of the opposites; and what is opposite is still within the field of its own opposite. So, what puts an end to sorrow? When you understand the process of thought, the process of effort, the process of memory, when you really understand, as I have explained, when you are aware of these three

processes, then what happens? When you are aware of something, what is your exact experience? Surely, when you are aware of something, there is no condemnatory attitude, is there? There is no justifying or identifying. You are simply aware. I am aware of that green, of those birds flying. In that awareness, there is no condemnation, there is no justification. Now, if you are aware of sorrow without the three processes at work trying to overcome it, if you are aware without condemnation then you will see there comes alert passivity, a passive awareness without any demand. You are very alert; there is no part of your being which is asleep, because you have explored, as we said, the whole process of memory, thought, effort, and therefore you are fully aware; and in that awareness there is a perceptivity, a quiet, a stillness, an observation. Without a prejudice, without a demand; and then you will find that sorrow comes to an end. But such awareness demands an extraordinarily persistent watchfulness to see how the mind works when there is suffering, to follow the swift movement of every thought and thereby comprehend the whole process of effort, of thought and of memory.

Question: You say love is chaste. Do you mean it is celibate?

Krishnamurti: Now, we are going to explore this problem and see the implications in it. So, please don't be on the offensive or the defensive; because, to understand you must explore, and exploration ceases when you are biased, when you are tethered to a tradition or to a belief. It is like an animal tied to a stake: it cannot wander far, and you must wander far to discover what is truth. You must go very deeply to find the truth of any problem; but, if you are anchored in a haven of belief, of tradition, or of prejudice, then

you will never find the truth of any problem. So, please, for this evening at least, let us explore together without being anchored - which is quite an arduous task in itself. Because, when you are prejudiced, surely the problem is distorted, and therefore the answer is also distorted; and to find the answer, one must study the problem without distortion, either defensive or offensive, either negative or positive. So, we are going to examine the problem together and see where it leads us.

In this question is involved the whole complex issue of sex. Religious teachers, traditional systems, have forbidden sexual intercourse, saying that it prevents man from realizing the highest, that you must be celibate in order to find God, truth, or whatever it be. Now, traditionally, that is what is generally accepted. But, if we want to find the truth of a problem, tradition and authority have no meaning. On the contrary, they become a hindrance - which does not mean that man must become licentious. Truth is not found in the opposite, for the opposite is the continuity of its own opposite. The antithesis is the continuation of the thesis in a different form. So, to find the truth of this matter, we must approach it very carefully, without the bias of tradition, without the fear of authority, and without the sneaking pleasure of indulgence. We must look at it and see its full significance.

First of all, why has sex become a problem to most of us? Why is it that practically everywhere in the world at the present time-it is one of the most extraordinary facts - men and women are caught in this sensate pleasure? Why is it that it has become such an intense, burning problem? If we do not understand that, we shall either condemn it or indulge in it. I am not saying it is right or

wrong - that would be a stupid way of regarding the problem. Must you be a celibate because the books say so? Must you lead a riotous life because other books say so? To think out the problem, we must think of it anew; and to think of it anew, we must leave the well-charted lines of the old. So, the problem is: Why is it that sex has become such a burning issue? First, obviously, because it is being stimulated by every possible means in modern society; every newspaper, every magazine, the cinemas and pictures, stimulate eroticism. The tradesman employs a woman to attract your attention, to make you buy a pair of shoes, or God knows what. So, through stimulation we are being bombarded with sex all the time. That is one fact. And society, civilization at the present time, is essentially the outcome of sensate value. Things, mundane things, have become extraordinarily important in our lives; position, wealth, name, have become of vital significance, because they are means to power, means to so-called freedom. Sensory values have become predominantly significant in our lives, and that is also one of the reasons for this overwhelming problem of sex. In thought, in feeling, you have ceased to be creative; you are just imitative machines, aren't you? Your religion is merely habit, following authority, tradition and fear, copying the book, following the rule, the example, the ideal. It has become a routine. Religion is merely mumbling words, going to the temple, or practicing a discipline - - which is all repetitive, copying, imitative, habit forming. And what happens to your mind and to your heart when you are merely imitative? Naturally, they wither, do they not? The mind, which must be swift, capable of deep penetration, deep understanding, has been made into a mere machine, a record-player which imitates,

copies, follows. It has ceased to be a mind, and your religion has become a matter of belief. Therefore, emotionally, inwardly, there is no creation, there is no creative response - only dullness, emptiness. The same is true of thought. What is your thinking, what is your existence? A hollow, empty routine, isn't it? - earning money, playing cards, going to cinemas, reading a few cheap books or very, very cultured ones. Again, what is that? Is it not also just a repetitive machine functioning without depth, without thought, without compassion, without vulnerability? How can such a mind be creative? So, what happens to your life? You are uncreative, unthoughtful, unmindful, imitating, copying; so naturally the only pleasure left to you is sex, which becomes your escape; therefore, being your only release, you are caught in it, and so there is the eternal question of how to get out. And your ideals, your disciplines, will not get you out. You may suppress it, you may hold it in, but that is not living creatively, happily, purely, nobly - it is living in constant fear. Sex is one of the ways of self-forgetfulness; in sex you momentarily forget yourself; and because you live so superficially, so imitatively, sex is the only thing left to you, so it becomes a problem. And naturally, when sex is the only thing left, there is no life.

We are not trying to solve the problem, we are trying to understand it; and in understanding it fully, we shall find the answer. To the many serious problems of life, there are no categorical answers, yes or no; but, in understanding the problem itself, we shall find the answer. The answer is that the problem will exist as long as there is no creativeness, as long as you are not free from imitation, from habit, as long as the mind is caught in mere

repetition, in the mere earning of money - which is a ruthless existence. In merely repeating, chanting, and all the rest of it there can be no creativeness. There is creativeness only through the release of creative thinking, creative being, creative existence, which means bringing about a radical revolution in our living - not a verbal revolution, but an inward revolution, a complete transformation of our lives. Then only will this problem have a different meaning; then life itself will have a different significance. Those who are trying to be celibate as a means of achieving reality, God - they are unchaste, they are ignoble, because their hearts are dry. Surely, without love, there cannot be purity, and a pure heart alone can find reality - not a disciplined heart, not a suppressed heart, not a distorted heart, but a heart that knows what it is to love. But you cannot love if you are caught in a habit, either religious or physical, psychological or sensate. So, a man who is trying to be a celibate can never understand reality; for to him celibacy is merely the imitation of an example, an ideal; and the imitation of an ideal is merely copying, therefore it is uncreative. But a man who knows how to love, how to be kind, how to be generous, how to give himself over to something completely without thought of self, that man knows love; and such love is chaste. Where there is such love the problem ceases to be.

Question: You say the present crisis is without precedent. In what way is it exceptional?

Krishnamurti: I do all the thinking, and you do all the listening - it is too bad. Sir, there is a danger in all these meetings that you merely become the audience and I become the talker. That is what has happened in the world. You all go to football and cricket



games, or to the cinema. Others are acting, others are playing, but never you. You have become uncreative - that is why you have so many destructive problems gnawing at your heart. So, don't please, if I may suggest, become the audience here - that would be too bad, and would have no meaning. It is so easy to listen to somebody else talking, so easy to read books which somebody else has written; but, if there were no books, if there were no preachers, you would have to think out your own problems, and then you would be extremely creative, would you not? That is what we are trying to do here. Fortunately, I have not read books, religious scriptures; but you have, and unfortunately, your minds are stuffed with other people's ideas - and that is your difficulty. Your difficulty is that you are not thinking, or you are thinking through other people's formulas, ideas, sayings, quotations. Therefore, you are really not thinking at all. These talks will be of no significance whatever if you merely become the observers, the listeners; because, you will find that I am not giving any answer to any problem. That would be too easy, that would be too stupid - to say yes or no to any issue. But, if we think out the problem together, easily, sanely, without being anchored to any prejudice, then we shall find the significance of the problem; then there will be creative happiness in the search. Surely, Sir, that search itself is devotion - not to an image, to an idea, but there is devotion in the very search of the problem and its meaning. There is joy, there is creative ecstasy, in finding out what is true; but if we merely listen, words have very little meaning. The word is not the thing; to find the thing, you must go beyond the word.

Surely, the present crisis is exceptional, is it not? Not because I

say so - I will say many things, but it will not be true if you merely repeat it. Propaganda is a lie, repetition is a lie. Obviously, the present crisis throughout the world is exceptional, without precedent. There have been crises of varying types at different periods throughout history, social, national, political. Crises come and go; economic recessions, depressions come, get modified, and continue in a different form. We know that, we are familiar with that process. But surely, the present crisis is different, is it not? It is different first because we are dealing, not with money, not with tangible things, but with ideas. The crisis is exceptional because it is in the field of ideation. We are quarrelling with ideas, we are justifying murder; in this country, as everywhere else in the world, we are justifying murder as a means to a righteous end, which in itself is unprecedented. Before, evil was recognized to be evil, murder was recognized to be murder; but now, murder is a means to achieve a noble result. Murder, whether of one person or of a group of people, is justified, because the murderer, or the group that the murderer represents, justifies it as a means of achieving a result which will be beneficial to man. That is, we sacrifice the present for the future - and it does not matter what means we employ as long as our declared purpose is to produce a result which will be beneficial to man. Therefore, the implication is that a wrong means will produce a right end, and you justify the wrong means through ideation. In the various crises that have taken place before the issue has been the exploitation of things or of man; but it is now the exploitation of ideas, which is much more pernicious, much more dangerous, because the exploitation of ideas is so devastating, so destructive. We have learned now the power of

propaganda, and that is one of the greatest calamities that can happen: to use ideas as a means to transform man. Surely that is what is happening in the world today. Man is not important - systems ideas, have become important. Man no longer has any significance. We can destroy millions of men as long as we produce a result, and the result is justified by ideas. We have a magnificent structure of ideas to justify evil; and, surely, that is unprecedented. Evil is evil, it cannot bring about good. War is not a means to peace. War may bring about secondary benefits, like more efficient airplanes, but it will not bring peace to man. War is intellectually justified as a means of bringing peace; and when the intellect has the upper hand in human life, it brings about an unprecedented crisis.

There are other causes also which indicate an unprecedented crisis. One of them is the extraordinary importance man is giving to sensate values, to property, to name, to caste and country, to the particular label you wear. You are either a Mohammedan or a Hindu, a Christian or a communist. Name and property, caste and country, have become predominantly important, which means that man is caught in sensate value, the value of things, whether made by the mind or by the hand. Things made by the hand or by the mind have become so important that we are killing, destroying, butchering, liquidating each other because of them. We are nearing the edge of a precipice; every action is leading us there, every political, every economic action is bringing us inevitably to the precipice, dragging us into this chaotic, confusing abyss. So, the crisis is unprecedented, and it demands unprecedented action. To leave, to step out of that crisis, needs a timeless action, an action

which is not based on idea, on system; because any action which is based on a system, on an idea, will inevitably lead to frustration. Such action merely brings us back to the abyss by a different route. So, as the crisis is unprecedented, there must also be unprecedented action, which means that the regeneration of the individual must be instantaneous, not a process of time. It must take place now, not tomorrow; for tomorrow is of transforming myself tomorrow, I invite confusion, I am still within the field of destruction. And is it possible to change now? Is it possible to completely transform oneself in the immediate, in the now? I say it is. To do that, to transform oneself immediately, now, demands a certain close following of all that I am saying; because understanding is always in the present, not in the future. I have already talked a little about this, and we will discuss it as we go along during the many Sundays to come.

The point is that, as the crisis is of an exceptional character, to meet it there must be revolution in thinking; and this revolution cannot take place through another, through any book, through any organization. It must come through us, through each one of us. Only then can we create a new society, a new structure away from this horror, away from these extraordinarily destructive forces that are being accumulated, piled up; and that transformation comes into being only when you as an individual begin to be aware of yourself in every thought, action, and feeling.

Question: Are there no perfect gurus who have nothing for the greedy seeker of eternal security, but who guide visibly or invisibly a loving heart?

Krishnamurti: Now, this question, whether one needs a guru, is

put over and over again in different forms. Sirs, the vast majority of you have gurus - that is one of the most extraordinary things here. So, for this evening at least, put them aside and let us investigate the problem. The questioner asks: 'Does a loving heart need a guide?' Do you understand? Surely, a loving heart needs no guide, for love itself is the real, the eternal. A loving heart is generous, kind, unreserved, withholding nothing, and such a heart knows the real; it knows that which is without a beginning and without an end. But most of us have no such heart. Our hearts are dry, empty, making a lot of noise. Our hearts are filled with the things of the mind. And as our hearts are empty, we go to another to fill them. We go to another seeking that eternal security which we call God; we go to another to find that permanent gratification which we call reality. Because our own hearts are dry, we are seeking a guru who will fill them. Can anyone, whether visible or invisible, fill your heart? Your gurus give you disciplines, practices; they don't tell you how to think, but rather what to think. And what happens? You practise, you meditate, you discipline, you conform yourself, and yet your heart remains dull, empty and unloving; you discipline yourself and tyrannize your family. Do you think that by meditating, disciplining yourself, you will know love? Sir, without love, you cannot find reality, can you? Without being tender, gentle, considerate, how can you know the real? And can anyone teach you how to love? Surely, love is not a technique. Through technique, you cannot know it, can you? You will know every other thing, but not love, So, you can never know reality through any discipline, through any practice, through any conformity; because, conformity, discipline, practice, is repetition,

which dulls the mind, freezes the heart - and that is what you want. You want to make your mind dull, because your mind is restless, wandering, active, incessantly striving; and not understanding this restless mind, you want to smother it, you want to discipline it according to your pattern, you want to force it according to a set of rules and regulations, and thereby you strangulate the mind, make the mind utterly dull. That is what is happening, is it not? Look at your mind: How dull it is, how insensitive, because you have pursued the gurus so long. It has become a habit, a routine, to go from one guru to another. Each guru tells you to do something, and you do it till you find it unsatisfactory, and then you go over to somebody else, thereby exhausting your mind by this constant use; for that which is constantly used is worn out. What you are really seeking in a guru is not understanding, but gratification, permanent security, which you call the eternal, God, the real, truth, or what you will. And since you seek gratification, you will find a guru who will gratify you; but surely, that is not understanding, it does not bring happiness, it does not bring love. On the contrary, it destroys love. Love is something new, eternal from moment to moment. It is never the same, never as it was before; and without its perfume, without its beauty and its goodness, to search through a guru for that which you must find out for yourself is utterly useless. So, our problem is not whether a visible or invisible guru will help us, but how to bring about that state of being in which we know what love is. For love is virtue, and virtue is not a practice; but virtue brings freedom. And it is only when there is freedom that the eternal can come into being.

So, our question is, how is it possible for a dull mind, an empty

heart, to come to love, to be sensitive, to know the beauty, the richness of love? First, you must be aware that your mind is dull, that your thought process has no significance. You must be aware that your heart is empty without finding excuses for it, without justifying or condemning it. Just be aware, try it, Sirs. Be aware and see if your mind is not dull, if your heart is not empty; though you are married, have children and possessions, is it not empty? Aren't you empty? Your mind is dull, though you know all the religious books; though your mind is an encyclopedia, full of information, it is dull, weary, exhausted. Just be aware, be passively aware without condemning without justifying; be open to discover how dull, how weary your mind is and also that your heart is empty, lonely and aching. I am not mesmerizing you - just be aware of all this and you will see, if you are passively aware, that there comes a transformation, an extraordinarily quick response; and in that response, you will know what it is to love. In that response, there is stillness, there is quiet; and in that quiet you will find the indescribable, the unutterable.

February 15, 1958

## **BOMBAY 6TH PUBLIC TALK 22ND FEBRUARY, 1948**

I shall try today to clarify the extraordinarily complex problem of our existence, very simply and very directly, if that is possible. You are fully aware, I think, that our existence is very complex and extraordinarily vast and subtle; and like all complex problems, I think we ought to approach it very simply. Though I may use ordinary words with a difficult meaning, or put it in a difficult way, you will find, if you care to think about it, that the approach is very simple, like that to all great scientific problems. The problem itself is complex, but it has to be approached very simply; and that is what I hope we will do this evening. Our existence is complex, and we try to solve a particular problem unrelated to other problems. That is, the problem of existence is not at one level only, but at different levels, and these problems at different levels are interrelated. The physiological problem is related to the psychological and spiritual problem, but we try to solve the problem of food, clothing and shelter on its own level, apart from the psychological level. We try to solve the economic problem as though it were completely unrelated to the psychological problem, and this effort to solve each of our human problems on its own level leads to catastrophic results. That is, if we try to solve the economic problem on its own level, not relating it to the psychological problem, it leads us to confusion and further catastrophes. So, departmental thinking can in no way solve the problem of existence. When the economists, the socialists, the communists, the psychologists, try to solve our difficult problems,



each purely on its own level, which means departmental thinking, then there is no way out of the mess.

So, we have to think of our existence as a whole, as a total process, and not as many unrelated processes at different levels. The different levels are interrelated, and therefore they must be thought of as a total process, not as separate, independent process. Our life, our daily existence, is a series of contradictions. We talk of peace, and try to live at peace, but we are preparing for war; we talk of freedom, but regimentation is taking place all the time. There is poverty and riches, evil and good, violence and non-violence. Our whole life is a series of contradictions. We want to be happy, and we do everything to bring about unhappiness; we want peace in the world, and yet everything we think, feel and do bring about war. So, we live in a series of contradictions, which I think is fairly obvious and with which we are quite familiar.

Now, to choose one of the contradictions is to avoid direct action, because choice at all times is a process of the avoidance of action. That is, if I choose one of the contradictions, peace, and do not understand its opposite, conflict, then such choice leads to inaction. It is not choice, but right thinking, that brings about integration. Where there is right thinking, contradictions are not possible; when we know how to think rightly, contradiction will cease. So, we have to find out what is right thinking, and not be caught in choice between good and evil, between war and peace, between riches and poverty, between freedom and regimentation. When right thinking comes into being, there is no contradiction. Contradiction is the very nature of the self, the seat of desire. So, to understand desire is the beginning of self-knowledge, and without

self-knowledge, there is no right thinking. If I don't know myself, the total process of myself, not only at the economic level of everyday existence, but at the different psychological levels, then I live in a state of contradiction; and to choose one of the opposites does not bring about integration. We see contradiction about us and in our lives, there is a constant battle of choice between right and wrong; and we choose one of the opposites, yet that does not bring about peace, integration. So, to choose is to avoid action, and only right thinking can bring about integration.

Our problem, then, is how to think rightly. Now, right thinking and right thought are two different states, are they not? Right thinking has to be discovered, whereas right thought is merely conformity to a pattern. Right thinking is a process, whereas right thought is static. Right thinking is constant movement, constant discovery; that is, only through constant awareness in action, which is relationship, can there be right thinking. But right thought is always static; you can pick up right thought. You can regiment your mind, force your mind, discipline it to think along right lines, but that is not right thinking. Right thinking can come into being only through self-knowledge, and self-knowledge is never static. I am using the word self - knowledge in its full meaning - knowledge of the self, not only the higher but the lower self. To me, the self, the desire, is both the high and the low. We have divided the self for convenience, as a means of escape; but actually, to understand the self, one must understand the whole process of thinking, which is consciousness.

So, right thinking alone can bring about integration and therefore freedom from the conflict of the opposites, freedom from

self-contradiction; and to understand self-contradiction, the battle that is going on within each one of us and which is expressed outwardly in the world, there must be an awareness of the process of our own thinking, awareness of every thought and every feeling - not merely the acceptance of pleasurable thoughts and the avoidance of ugly ones, but awareness of all thoughts and all feelings. And, to understand, there must be no condemnation; because the moment you condemn a thing, you cease to understand it. So, self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, from which comes right thinking; and without right thinking there can be no right action, and therefore no creation of a new social structure.

So, our problem is, is it not?, that, living in a state of contradiction, we are caught in a contradictory society which is the result of our own projection. I want, and I don't want; I want to live at peace, and at the same time I see that I am antisocial. We live in a state of constant contradiction, and therefore there is disintegration; and any action that springs from that state of contradiction is bound to lead to further conflict and disintegration. To bring about integration, there must be right thinking; right thinking can come into being only through self-knowledge; and self-knowledge is a process of constant discovery of the full significance of each thought and each feeling. That is, there must be constant awareness, without condemnation or justification, of every thought, of every movement, of every feeling - awareness, not only of the superficial consciousness, but also of the motives, the intimations, the significance of all our hidden thoughts, pursuits and desires. As you are more and more aware you will find that there comes a deeper and deeper understanding. From this

understanding comes right thinking, and only right thinking can bring about the right solution to the many problems that confront each one of us.

Question: Is not the longing expressed in prayer a way to God?

Krishnamurti: First of all we are going to examine the problems contained in this question. In it are implied prayer, concentration and meditation. Now, what do we mean by prayer? First of all, in prayer there is petition, supplication to what you call God, reality. You, as an individual, are demanding, petitioning, begging, seeking guidance from something which you call God; therefore your approach is one of seeking a reward, seeking a gratification. You are in trouble, national or individual, and you pray for guidance; or you are confused, and you beg for clarity, you look for help to what you call God. In this is implied that God, whatever God may be - we won't discuss that for the moment - , is going to clear up the confusion which you and I have created. Because, after all, it is we who have brought about the confusion, the misery, the chaos, the appalling tyranny, the lack of love; and we want what we call God to clear it up. In other words, we want our confusion, our misery, our sorrow, our conflict, to be cleared away by somebody else, we petition another to bring us light and happiness.

Now, when you pray, when you beg, petition for something, it generally comes into being. When you ask, you receive; but what you receive will not create order, because what you receive does not bring clarity, understanding. It only satisfies, gives gratification, but does not bring about understanding; because, when you demand, you receive that which you yourself project. How can reality, God, answer your particular demand? Can the

immeasurable, the unutterable, be concerned with our petty little worries, miseries, confusions, which we ourselves have created? Therefore, what is it that answers? Obviously, the immeasurable cannot answer the measured, the petty, the small. But what is it that answers? At that moment, when we pray, we are fairly silent, in a state of receptivity; and then our own subconscious brings a momentary clarity. That is, you want something, you are longing for it, and in that moment of longing, of obsequious begging, you are fairly receptive; your conscious, active mind is comparatively still, so the unconscious projects itself into that and you have an answer. But it is surely not an answer from reality, from the immeasurable - it is your own unconscious responding. So, don't let us be confused and think that when your prayer is answered you are in relationship with reality. Reality must come to you; you cannot go to it.

Then, in this problem of prayer, there is another factor involved: the response of that which we call the inner voice. I said, when the mind is supplicating, petitioning, it is comparatively still; and when you hear the inner voice, it is your own voice projecting itself into that comparatively still mind. Again, how can it be the voice of reality? A mind that is confused, ignorant, craving, demanding, petitioning, how can it understand reality? The mind can receive reality only when it is absolutely still, not demanding, not craving, not longing, not asking, whether for yourself, for the nation, or for another. When the mind is absolutely still, when desire ceases, then only reality comes into being. But a person who is demanding, petitioning, supplicating, longing for direction, such a person will find what he seeks, but it will not be the truth. What he receives

will be the response of the unconscious layers of his own mind, which project themselves into the conscious; and that still, small voice which directs him is not the real, but only the response of the unconscious.

Then, in this problem of prayer, there is also the question of concentration. With most of us, concentration is a process of exclusion. Concentration is brought about through effort, compulsion, direction, imitation, and so concentration is a process of exclusion. I am interested in so-called meditation, but my thoughts are distracted. So, I fix my mind on a picture, an image, or an idea, and exclude all other thoughts; and this process of concentration, which is exclusion, is considered to be a means of meditating. That is what you do, is it not? When you sit down to meditate, you fix your mind on a word, on an image, or on a picture; but the mind wanders all over the place. There is the constant interruption of other ideas, other thoughts, other emotions, and you try to push them away, you spend your time battling with your thoughts. This process you call meditation. That is, you are trying to concentrate on something in which you are not interested, and your thoughts keep on multiplying, increasing, interrupting. So, you spend your energy in exclusion, in warding off, pushing away; and if you can concentrate on your chosen thought, on a particular object, you think you have at last succeeded in meditation. Surely, that is not meditation, is it? Meditation is not an exclusive process - exclusive in the sense of warding off, building resistance against encroaching ideas. So, prayer is not meditation, and concentration as exclusion is not meditation.

So, what is meditation? Concentration is not meditation,

because where there is interest it is comparatively easy to concentrate on something. A general who is planning war, butchery, is very concentrated. A business man making money is very concentrated - he may even be ruthless, putting aside every other feeling and concentrating completely on what he wants, a man who is interested in anything is naturally, spontaneously concentrated, But, surely, such concentration is not meditation, it is merely exclusion.

So, what is meditation? Obviously, it is not fixing your mind on an object, on a word, on an idea, on a phrase, an image, or a speculative hope. Surely, that is merely concentration on what you want. As a business man concentrates on making money, so you concentrate on what you want and exclude, push aside, battle with the encroaching waves of thought. Surely, that is not meditation, is it?

So, what is meditation? Surely, meditation is understanding - meditation of the heart is understanding. How can there be understanding if there is exclusion? How can there be understanding when there is petition, supplication? In understanding there is peace, there is freedom; that which you understand, from that you are liberated. But, merely to concentrate, or to pray, does not bring understanding. So, understanding is the very basis, the fundamental process of meditation. You don't have to accept my word for it; but if you examine prayer and concentration very carefully, deeply, you will find that neither of them leads to understanding. They merely lead to obstinacy, to a fixation, to illusion. Whereas, meditation, in which there is understanding, brings about freedom, clarity and integration.

So, then, what do we mean by understanding? Understanding means giving right significance, right valuation, to all things. To be ignorant is to give wrong values; the very nature of stupidity is the lack of comprehension of right values. So, understanding comes into being when there are right values, when right values are established. And how is one to establish right values - the right value of property, the right value of relationship, the right value of ideas? For the right values to come into being, you must understand the thinker, must you not? If I don't understand the thinker, which is myself, what I choose has no meaning, that is, if I don't know myself, then my action, my thought, have no foundation whatsoever. So, self-knowledge is the beginning of meditation - not the knowledge that you pick up from my books, from authorities, from gurus, but the knowledge that comes into being through self-inquiry, which is self-awareness. Meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge, and without self-knowledge there is no meditation. Because, if I don't understand the ways of my thoughts, of my feelings, if I don't understand my motives, my desires, my demands, my pursuit of patterns of action, which are ideas - I do not know myself, there is no foundation for thinking; and the thinker who merely asks, prays, or excludes, without understanding himself, must inevitably end in confusion, in illusion.

So, the beginning of meditation is self-knowledge, which means being aware of every movement of thought and feeling, knowing all the layers of my consciousness - not only the superficial layers, but the hidden, the deeply concealed activities. But, to know the deeply concealed activities, the hidden motives, responses,



thoughts and feelings, there must be tranquillity in the conscious mind; that is, the conscious mind must be still in order to receive the projection of the unconscious. The superficial, conscious mind is occupied with its daily activities, with earning a livelihood, deceiving others, exploiting others, running away from problems - all the daily activities of our existence. That superficial mind must understand the right significance of its own activities and thereby bring tranquillity to itself. It cannot bring about tranquillity, stillness, by mere regimentation, by compulsion, by discipline. It can bring about tranquillity, peace, stillness, only by understanding its own activities, by observing them, by being aware of them, by seeing its own ruthlessness, how it talks to the servant, to the wife, to the daughter, to the mother, and so on. When the superficial, conscious mind is thus fully aware of all its activities, through that understanding it becomes spontaneous, quiet, not drugged by compulsion or regimented by desire; and then it is in a position to receive the intimations, the hints of the unconscious, of the many, many hidden layers of the mind - the racial instincts, the buried memories, the concealed pursuits, the deep wounds that are still unhealed. It is only when all these have projected themselves and are understood, when the whole consciousness is unburdened, unfettered by any wound, by any memory whatsoever, that it is in a position to receive the eternal.

So, meditation is self-knowledge, and without self-knowledge there is no meditation. If you are not aware of all your responses all the time, if you are not fully conscious, fully cognizant of your daily activities, merely to lock yourself in a room and sit down in front of a picture of your guru, of your Master, to do puja, to

meditate, is an escape. Because, without self-knowledge there is no right thinking, and without right thinking, what you do has no meaning, however noble your intentions are. So, prayer has no significance without self-knowledge; but when there is self-knowledge, there is right thinking, and hence right action. When there is right action, there is no confusion, and therefore there is no supplication to someone else to lead you out of it. A man who is fully aware, is meditating; he does not pray, because he does not want anything. Through prayer, through regimentation, through repetition, through japam and all the rest of it, you can bring about a certain stillness; but that is mere dullness, reducing the mind and the heart to a state of weariness. It is drugging the mind; and exclusion, which you call concentration, does not lead to reality, no exclusion ever can. What brings about understanding is self-knowledge, and it is not very difficult to be aware if there is right intention. If you are interested to discover the whole process of yourself - not merely the superficial part, but the total process of your whole being - , then it is comparatively easy. If you really want to know yourself, you will search out your heart and your mind to know their full content; and when there is the intention to know, you will know. Then you can follow, without condemnation or justification, every movement, of thought and feeling; and by following every thought and every feeling as it arises, you bring about tranquillity which is not compelled, not regimented, but which is the outcome of having no problem, no contradiction. It is like the pool that becomes peaceful, quiet, any evening when there is no wind; and when the mind is still, then that which is immeasurable comes into being.

Question: Why is your teaching so purely psychological? There is no cosmology, no theology, no ethics, no aesthetics, no sociology, no political science, not even hygiene. Why do you concentrate only on the mind and its workings?

Krishnamurti: For a very simple reason, Sir. If the thinker can understand himself, then the whole problem is solved. Then he is creation, he is reality; and then what he does will not be antisocial. Virtue is not an end in itself; virtue brings freedom, and there can be freedom only when the thinker, which is the mind, ceases. That is why one has to understand the process of the mind, the `I', the bundle of desires that create the `I', my property, my wife, my ideas, my God. Surely, it is because the thinker is so confused that his actions are confused; it is because the thinker is confused that he seeks reality, order, peace. Because the thinker is confused, ignorant, he wants knowledge; and because the thinker is in contradiction, in conflict, he pursues ethics to control, to guide, to support him. So, if I can understand myself, the thinker, then the whole problem is solved, is it not? Then I will not be antisocial, I will not be rich and exploit the poor, I will not want things, things, things, which brings about a conflict between those who have and those who have not. Then I will have no caste, no nationality, there will be no separation between man and man. Then we shall love each other, we shall be kind. So, what is important, then, is not cosmology, not theology, not hygiene - though hygiene is necessary, and cosmology and theology are unnecessary; but what is important is to understand myself, the thinker.

Now, is the thinker different from his thoughts? If thought ceases, is there the thinker? Can the quality be removed from the

thinker? When the qualities of the thinker are removed, is there the thinker, the 'I'? So, thoughts themselves are the thinker, they are not separate. The thinker has separated himself from his thoughts in order to safeguard himself; he can then always modify his thoughts according to circumstances, and yet remain aloof as the thinker. The moment he begins to modify the thinker, the thinker ceases. So, it is one of the tricks of the mind to separate the thinker from the thoughts, and then to be concerned about the thoughts, how to change them, how to modify them, how to transform them - all of which is a deception, an illusion. Because, the thinker is not if thought is not, and mere modification of thoughts does not do away with the thinker. That is one of the clever ways the thinker has of protecting himself, of giving himself permanency; whereas thoughts are impermanent. So, the self is perpetuated; but the self is not permanent, whether the higher self or the lower self. Both are still within the field of memory, within the field of time.

So, the reason why I give so much importance and urgency to the psychology of the mind, is that the mind is the cause of all action; and without understanding that, merely to reform, to potter around, to trim the superficial actions, has very little meaning. We have done that for generations, and have brought about confusion, madness, and misery in the world. So, we have to go to the very root of the whole problem of existence, of consciousness, which is the 'I', the thinker; and without understanding the thinker and its activities, mere superficial social reforms have no significance - at least, not for the man who is very serious, very earnest. That is why it is important for each of us to find out on that we are laying emphasis - whether on the superficial, the outward, or on the

fundamental. Because, Sirs, with the world in such an insane mood of butchering, of destroying, of hurling man against man, surely the time has come for those who are really in earnest, purposeful, to tackle the problem radically and profoundly, and not deal with superficial reforms and trimmings. That is why it is important to know for yourself on what to lay emphasis, and not depend on another to tell you. If you give importance to the psychology of the thinker merely because I do, then you will be imitative and you can be persuaded to imitate somebody else when this does not suit you. So, you must think out this problem very seriously and very profoundly, and not wait for somebody to tell you on what to lay emphasis. Surely, all this is so obvious and clear. Organized religion, party and power politics, socialism, capitalism, communism, all have failed because they are not dealing with the fundamental nature of man. They want to trim the environmental influences; and what value has that when man is inwardly sick, diseased and confused? Surely, a good doctor is not concerned only with the symptoms. Symptoms are merely indicative. He goes to the cause, and eradicates the cause. So, a man who is in earnest has to go to the cause, and not superficially play with words; and the fundamental cause of this misery in the world is the lack of understanding of the process of ourselves. We do not want to bring order within ourselves, but only outward order. There will be outward order when there is inward order, because the inward always overcomes the outer. So, the emphasis obviously must be laid on the psychological process, with all its implications. When one understands oneself, there is happiness, there is peace, and a happy man is not in conflict with his neighbour. It is only the

miserable man, the ignorant man, who is in conflict; his actions are antisocial, and wherever he goes he creates misery and more conflict. But a man who understands himself is at peace, and therefore his actions are peaceful.

Question: You have said that all progress is in charity only, and that what we call progress is merely a process of disintegration. What is there to disintegrate? Chaos is always with us, and there is neither progress nor regress in chaos.

Krishnamurti: I said there is technological progress, but otherwise there is no progress at all - which we see, obviously, in the world about us. There is progress, technological progress, from the simple wheel to this extraordinary thing called the airplane, the jet plane; but is there a progress of our minds, of our hearts? Do you love? Surely, Sir, action which is integrating, which is complete, can take place only where there is love, where there is charity; and without charity, without love, all technological progress leads to destruction, to disintegration. That is what is happening in the world at the present time. We are progressing towards chaos, because we are not progressing in charity - which opens up an enormous problem, and I don't think we will have time this evening to go into it fully. It is this: Is there such a thing at all as progress, evolution? I know there is technological progress, the evolution of better machines, and all the rest of it; but do you and I evolve? What is the thing that evolves, and towards what? Ignorance can never evolve into wisdom, greed can never become that which is not greed. Greed will always be greed, though it progresses, evolves. Through time, ignorance can never become wisdom. Ignorance must cease for wisdom to be; greed must cease

for that which is not greed to come into being. So, when you talk of evolving, of progressing, you mean becoming something: you are this, and you will become that; you are the clerk, and you will become the manager; you are the priest, and you will become the bishop; you are poor, but you will become rich; you are evil, but you will eventually become good. This becoming is what you call progress, evolution; but it is merely the continuity, in a modified form, of that which is. Becoming is the continuity of what is in a modified form, and therefore there cannot be fundamental change in, what you call progress. We will discuss it another time, because it needs going into very, very carefully.

In becoming, in continuity, can there ever be evolution, can there ever be progress? Only in ending is there rebirth, not in continuity. But progress, surely, can exist only in technological things, and you cannot 'progress' in charity - that is, in the comparative sense of becoming more charitable, more loving. Where there is love, there is no comparison. Don't you know? When you love somebody, you love, you give yourself over completely - the you is non-existent. As long as the 'you' remains, there is the desire to become, and in becoming there is no rebirth. Becoming is only a modified continuity, and that which continues, decays; that which continues, knows death; but that which is ending is free of death.

Question: We know that thought destroys feeling. How to feel without thinking?

Krishnamurti: Obviously, we know that rationalizing, calculating, bargaining, destroys feeling, love, affection. Have you not noticed that the more you rationalize, the more you bargain, the

more you exploit, the more you use the mind, the less feeling there is? Because, feeling is very dangerous, to feel is very dangerous, is it not? To feel very strongly might lead you to what you call chaos, to confusion, to disorder; therefore you control it by rationalizing, and by rationalizing it you cease to be generous. Your feeling is destroyed when there is the thought process, which is naming, terming. You have a feeling of pain, of pleasure, of anger, and by terming it, by giving it a name, which is thinking about it, you modify it, and thereby reduce the feeling. Don't you know? When you feel generous, when you spontaneously want to give your shirt to somebody, your mind comes in and says, 'What will happen?'. You begin to rationalize your feeling, and then you become charitable through organizations, not directly - which is avoidance of action. Strong feelings are dangerous, love is very dangerous; therefore you begin to think about love, which minimizes and slowly destroys love.

The next question is, 'Is it possible to feel without thinking?'. What do we mean by thinking? Thinking, merely, is the response of memory, either of pain or of pleasure. That is, there is no thinking without the residue of experience; and feeling - when I use the word 'feeling' I mean love, not desire, not emotionalism, not all the putrefied stuff which you call feeling - , love cannot be brought within the field of thought. So, the more you respond to memory, which is called thinking, the less love there is. Love is burning, never still, it is from moment to moment, creative, new, fresh, joyous, and therefore it is very dangerous in society, in our relationship; so thought steps in, thought being the response of memory, and modifies love, controls it, tames it, guides it,



legalizes it, puts it out of danger. Then it can live with it. Don't you know? When you love somebody, you love the whole of mankind - not just one person, you love man. And it is dangerous to love man, is it not? Because, then there is no barrier, no nationality, there is no craving for money, for position, for things - and such a man is dangerous to society, is he not? But you all want many things. You want fame, you build around yourselves a hood of ideas, of exclusions, and that is why a man who loves is dangerous to society; and so society, which is you, begins to build a thought process, which soon destroys love. For love to be, memory, with all its complex processes, has to come to an end. That is, memory arises only when experience is not fully, completely understood. Memory is only the residue of experience; memory is the result of a challenge which is not fully comprehended. Life is a process of challenge and response, the challenge always being new and the response always being old. So, one has to understand the old, the conditioned response, which means that thought must free itself from the past, from time, from yesterday; it must live each day, each minute, as completely, as fully, and as newly as possible. And you do that when you love, when your heart is full; you cannot do it with words, with things made by the mind, but only when you love. Then memory the thought that is merely the response of memory, ceases; then every minute is a new minute, every movement is a rebirth, and to love the one is to love the whole.

February 22, 1948

## **BOMBAY 7TH PUBLIC TALK 29TH FEBRUARY, 1948**

This evening I shall answer questions only, and before I do so I would like to point out one or two things. I think there is an art in listening. Most of us listen through a screen of prejudice. Either we are expecting a definite solution to our problems, or we are not aware of the innumerable prejudices which prevent us from really hearing what another says, or we are not sufficiently interested or concentrated to listen at all, To listen truly is to listen without strain, without struggle, without the effort of hearing; it is to listen as we would to music, to something that we know and enjoy, not merely to the repetition of a record, but to something fresh, new. You know what I mean. When you are enjoying something, a conversation, a piece of music, or when reading literature, you listen, and the words, the music, the sound, the silence between two notes, slips in, enters without your struggling to understand. So, if I may suggest, it will be good if we can listen without making the effort to listen, without accepting or rejecting; if we can listen without erecting a barrier of defence, or trying too eagerly to grasp what is being said. There must be a certain tension, like that of the violin string. When it is at the right tension, it gives the right note. Similarly, if we listen with right tension, with right awareness, then I think we will understand far more deeply and extensively than by merely listening to verbal expression. Then, if you are really aware, the words have a different significance, they penetrate far more deeply. It is like a seed that is sown in rich soil. So, if I may suggest, please listen to these answers, not so much

with the intention of grasping the solution to the question, but rather let us consider that you and I are going to think out the problem together aloud and see where it leads us. Because, answering questions must be a rediscovery, to me as well as to you, not merely a repetition of an old record which you and I have learnt by heart. After all, music is the silence between two notes. If it were a continuous sound, there would be no music. It is the silence between two notes that gives emphasis, beauty to the notes. Similarly, it is silence between words, between thoughts, that gives significance, meaning to the thought. So, in listening to the answers to these questions, what is important is neither to accept nor to reject, but to understand what is being said without the barrier of prejudice. This is extremely arduous, because most of us are so grossly prejudiced, and are so unconscious of our prejudice, that it is very difficult to penetrate the thick armour of our own intentions, of our own bias; but if we can, at least for an evening, put this thick armour aside and listen as though we were really enjoying something together, then I think this and other meetings will have a definite significance.

Question: Our ideals are the only thing between ourselves and madness. You are breaking a dam which keeps chaos out of our homes and fields. Why are you so foolhardy? The immature and the unsteady minds will be thrown off their feet by your sweeping generalizations.

Krishnamurti: This question is put with regard to what I have said concerning ideals, examples, and the opposites; so, we will have to go over what I have said concerning ideals. And, as I have just said, please listen, not as if through a wall of resistance, but

rather with a wish to understand. You have certain traditions and ideals, and perhaps what I am going to say will be contrary to everything that you think; and what I say may or may not be the truth. So, you have to listen with a certain resistance, with a certain freedom, with a certain elasticity; but if you merely enclose yourself within the walls of your own ideals, your own understanding, then, surely, what is being said will have no meaning. What I am going to say may be, and I think probably will be, quite contrary to what you believe; so, please listen to it, not with any dogmatism, or with any defensive mechanism, but with a sense of trying to understand what the other fellow is trying to say.

Now, I have said that ideals in any form are an escape from the understanding of what is; that ideals, however noble, however intriguing, however fine, have no reality. Ideals are fictitious, without significance, because it is more important to understand what is than to pursue an ideal, or follow an ideal or a mode of action. We have innumerable ideals - non-violence, good, non-greed, peace, merit, and so on. You know the innumerable ideals within which our minds are enclosed. Now, are not these ideals fictitious? They are not really factual, they are non-existent, and since they are non-existent, of what value are they? Do they help me to understand my conflict, my violence, my greed, or are they a hindrance to that understanding? Will the screen of ideals help me to understand my arrogance, my violence, my evil? If ideals help me to understand, then they have significance; but if they do not give understanding, then they are valueless. Can a violent man become peaceful through the ideal of non-violence? Can I understand violence through the screen of my own idealism of non-

violence? Must I not put aside the screen, the ideal, and examine my violence directly? And will the ideal help me to understand violence? This is a very fundamental and important question. We ought to spend a little time on it, because the issues arising from it are very significant, and our whole social structure is based on this idealism which has no reality behind it.

So, our problem is: Is evil ever understood through the ideal of good? Is not evil transformed, not through an ideal, not through the pursuit of its opposite, but in the direct understanding of evil itself? And does not the ideal in any form, which is the opposite, prevent the understanding of what is? I am greedy, I am violent, I am arrogant, I am angry, vicious, brutal; and will the ideal of non-violence, non-greed, kindness, help me to overcome that which I am? Surely, we have tried the pursuit of the ideal, of the opposite, and we are familiar with the conflict thus created between the opposites. We know all that very well. We are entirely familiar with that extraordinary struggle to become something other than what we are. Our religious, social, and moral education is based on this attempt to become something, to transform what is into something which it is not; and we know the struggle, the pain, the constant battle of the opposites, of the thesis and antithesis, hoping to arrive at a synthesis which is beyond both. Though we have not succeeded in arriving at that state, we are familiar with the constant battle of the opposites which is supposed to bring it about.

Now, is that struggle necessary? Is not that struggle fallacious, unreal? Is not the opposite unreal? What is the real, the factual? The fact is, I am arrogant. Humility, the ideal is non-existent, it is fictitious. It is a creation of the mind as a means of escaping from

what is. You are violent; and will the opposite help you to overcome that which you are? Obviously not. For centuries you have struggled to overcome it, yet you are violent. So the method of our approach must be wrong, and therefore there must be a new approach, a different way of attacking the problem of greed, of arrogance, of violence. But first we must see the fallacy of the ideal. As it was suggested to me this morning. India is the nation which fabricates ideals. Your pet industry is creating ideals for the world. And do we need ideals? Please, this is really a very important question. If you have no ideals, will you collapse, will you become immoral? Are your ideals acting as a dam against your immoral actions? Is your ideal of non-violence preventing you from being violent? The ideal of not being greedy, of having just enough to live, is that making you less greedy? Obviously not. Sir, we must look at this, mustn't we? The man who is greedy, who wants to pursue riches, goes on doing it in spite of the ideal which he talks about. Obviously, ideals are non-existent except in theory, and therefore they are valueless. So, why pursue them? In other words, an idealist is really a man who is escaping from that which is, who is avoiding action in the present. We are all very familiar with the idealist, how hard they are, how brutal, how resistant with that quality of hardness, because they are really avoiding the central issue, which is what they are. So, by removing the ideals, will the weak-minded be thrown off their feet? The weak-minded are already thrown off their feet by politicians, by the gurus, by their pujas, by their wedding ceremonies; and the man who is strong disregards the ideals anyhow, he pursues what he wants. So, neither party pays any attention to the ideals, which are a very

convenient way to cover up a great many false things.

So, is an ideal necessary to understand what is? Will the ideal of non-violence help me to understand violence? That is, if I am violent and want to transcend violence must I have the ideal of non-violence? Surely, I don't have to have it do I? It is a hindrance, a positive hindrance to my direct understanding of the state in which I am, which is violence. So, the ideal, the opposite, the example, is a hindrance, an avoidance of the direct understanding of what is. Being violent, can I not understand it and transcend it? I can tackle it, I can understand it, only when I am not escaping from it, when I haven't this fantasy of the ideal, when I can look at it, examine it, and act upon it directly. But I don't want to act upon it directly, and therefore I invent this marvellous thing called the opposite, the ideal - a state which I can never achieve, because it is merely a postponement. So, the problem is: how to transcend, how to go beyond what is, which is violence, and not how to achieve the opposite. There is no opposite. There are the opposites of man and woman, a biological fact; but the opposite that the mind has created is non-existent. It is a convenient ruse, a trick of the mind to avoid acting directly upon what is. Can I transcend that which is, and not transform it, not make it into something else? I am greedy, violent; and can that violence, greed, come to an end? Obviously, it comes to an end when I can examine it and be completely aware of its whole social and psychological significance; but I can examine it only when there is no escape from what is - which none of us want to do, and that is the difficulty. None of us are honest enough to acknowledge that we are what we are, and then do something about it. To know that I am a liar, to know that I am greedy, is already

the beginning of freedom from greed, from falsehood. But to acknowledge it requires a certain honesty, and as we are so dishonest in our thinking, in our relationships, in almost everything that we do, we are incapable of facing what is. So, in this question is involved seeing the truth in the false, that is seeing the truth of the falseness of the ideal; and the moment one is capable of seeing the truth in the false, one is also able to see that which is true as being true. It is that truthfulness, the acknowledgment that you are greedy, that you are violent, seeing the fact - of what you are without any pretence, that brings about liberation from it, and not the pursuit of the opposite.

Question: Will the sexual urge disappear when we refuse to name it?

Krishnamurti: I am afraid the question needs considerable explanation. It arises, apparently, from what we discussed yesterday evening. Now, the process of naming, terming, is quite a complex problem, and we must go into it very carefully and precisely; that is, we must understand the process of consciousness. I am sorry that in this question, though it is very simply put, a great deal is involved; and if I answer it too directly and briefly, those who were not at the discussion yesterday may misunderstand. So, I must go into it carefully, explaining the whole issue,

Now, what do we mean by consciousness? I am not asking this question irrelevantly. It is directly connected with the question itself. What do we mean by consciousness? Consciousness, surely, is challenge and response, which is experiencing. That is the beginning of consciousness - challenge, response, and experiencing. The experience is named, termed, given a label as



pleasant or unpleasant, and then it is recorded, put away in the mind. So, consciousness is a process of experiencing, naming and recording. Though complex, it is very simple. Please don't needlessly complicate it. Without the three processes at work, which are really a unitary process - experiencing, naming or terming and recording, pigeonholing, putting experience away in the framework of memory - , without this process, there is no consciousness. Now, this process is going on all the time, instantaneously, at different levels, and that is what you call consciousness. The song is repeated in different moods, with different themes, profoundly, in the deep layers of the unconscious, or superficially, on the surface of consciousness, in our everyday life; but it is always the same process of challenge and response, experiencing, naming or terming, and recording or memory. This is the theme, this is the record that is being played. Now, what would happen if the middle process, which is naming or terming, were not done, if the middle process were put an end to? Why do we term, why do we give a name to a feeling or to an experience calling it pleasant or unpleasant, anger, violence, good, bad, and so on? Why do we term an experience?

Please, to some of you all this may appear to be technical. It is not technical. It is very simple, though it demands a little concentration. Most of us are used to political lectures, being told what to do or what to think, and we may find it difficult to pursue, evenly, easily, a thought of this kind; but as this is not a political lecture, we will have to be a little concentrated.

So, consciousness is a process of experiencing, naming, and recording; and why is it that we give a name to an experience, to a

feeling? We give it a name, either to communicate it to another; or else to fix it in memory, which is to give it continuity,. If there is no continuity, then mind is not, consciousness is not. I must give continuity to an experience, otherwise consciousness ceases.

Therefore, I must give it a name. The giving of a name to a feeling, to an experience, is instantaneous; because the mind, which is the record-keeper, memory, labels a feeling in order to give it substance, in order to give it continuity, in order to be able to examine it - which means the continuation of thought. After all, the thinker is the thought; and without the process of thought, without giving continuity to the process of thought, there is no permanency for the thinker. So, naming a feeling, an experience, gives permanency to the thinker, to the record-keeper, which is the mind. That is, you give a name to a feeling, to an experience, and thereby give it continuity; and upon this, the mind feeds and feels itself to be existent. Take any experience, any feeling or sensation that you have - anger, hatred, love; by giving it a name, you have stabilized it, you have put it within the framework of reference. So, the very nature of terming an experience is the giving of continuity to consciousness, to the `I'. This process is going on all the time, so swiftly that we are unconscious of it. This record is being played ceaselessly at different levels, in different themes, with different words, whether waking or sleeping.

Now, what happens if you don't term, if you don't give a name to an experience? If you are not naming the various sensations, if you have no background, where is the `you'? That is, when it is not named, the feeling or the experience withers away, it has no continuity. Experiment with yourself, and you will see. If you have

a very strong feeling of nationalism, what happens? You give it a name, the thought arises of idealism, love, 'my country'; that is, you term it and thereby give it a continuity. It is very difficult not to term it, because the process of naming a feeling is so automatic, so instantaneous. But suppose you do not name a feeling, what happens to that feeling? Surely, the record-keeper cannot identify himself with that feeling. He does not give it substance, he does not give it strength, he does not give it vitality. Therefore, it withers away. The next time you are feeling the sensation which you term irritation, don't give it a name. Don't say, 'I am irritated', don't term it, and see what happens. You will discover an extraordinary thing happening. The mind is bewildered, because the mind dislikes to be in a state of uncertainty. Then bewilderment becomes more important than the feeling, and the feeling is forgotten and bewilderment remains. But the mind does not like to be bewildered, puzzled; therefore, it demands security, and it seeks security, certainty, in the record, in memory, thereby strengthening the record-keeper.

It is really quite fascinating, if you observe the process of your own consciousness. But you cannot learn all this in a book. No book can teach it, and what a book teaches is not worthwhile. You can only repeat what a book teaches; but if you experiment and discover for yourself, then you are both the teacher and the pupil, and you no longer want the gurus, the books, and all the rest of it. Then you know how to tackle the problem, any problem that arises, for yourself, because you are both the teacher and the pupil, you know the ways of the working of your own consciousness. You discover that in not terming a sensation, in not giving it a name,

that feeling, that sensation comes to an end.

And now you will say 'I have learned a very good trick. I know how to deal with unpleasant feelings, how to make them come to an end quickly: I won't term them'. But will you do the same with regard to pleasant feelings? I am afraid you won't. Because, you want pleasant feelings to continue, you want to give substance to pleasant sensations, you want to maintain them. Therefore, you will keep on giving them names. But that does not lead anywhere; because, the moment you give a name, a term, to a feeling which is pleasant, you are inevitably creating the opposite, and therefore you will always have the conflict of the opposites. Whereas, if you don't name, term, label, a sensation, whether pleasant or unpleasant, they both wither away; and therefore the thinker, who is the creator of the opposites, comes to an end. Then only shall we know what love is, because love is not a sensation. You can name it, but when you name it, you are naming the sensation of love, which is not love. When you love somebody, what happens? When you think about a person, what happens? You are really dealing with the sensation of that person; you are concerned with that sensation, and the more you give emphasis to sensation the less there is of love.

Now, the question is, "will the sexual urge disappear when we refuse to name it?" It will disappear, obviously; but if you don't understand the whole process of consciousness, as I have carefully explained, merely putting an end to a particular urge, pleasant or unpleasant, does not bring about that eternal quality of love. Without love, merely putting an end to an urge has no meaning, and you will become as dry as the idealist whose passions are very

carefully held in check. Because, if you do not understand the whole process of consciousness, the passions are always there, though you refuse to name them. To understand the whole process, is very arduous. You may have understood the verbal expressions of what I have explained, but the living significance, the inward meaning, you will understand only through experimentation. As I have said, where there is love, there is chastity. But the man, the idealist who is passionate and wants to be chaste, who wants to become dispassionate - such a man will never know love, because he is only concerned with becoming something, which is another form of selfishness. He is only concerned with his struggle to achieve, to reach the ideal, which is non-existent. Therefore such a man has an empty heart, and he fills his empty heart with the things made by the mind. And how can he know love, when his heart is filled with the ideal, which is a thing made by the mind?

So, it is a very complex and subtle problem, this question of terming, giving a name; but you will understand it if you experiment with it. There are enormous riches, an enormous depth, in understanding this process of terming, naming a feeling a sensation. Once you open the door to it, you will discover vast riches; but to discover, there must be freedom to experiment, and freedom comes through virtue - not in becoming virtuous, but in being virtuous.

Question: Why can't you influence the leaders of a party, or members of a government, and work through them?

Krishnamurti: For the simple reason that leaders are factors of degeneration in society, and governments are the expression of violence. And how can you, how can any man who really wants to

understand truth, work through instruments which are opposed to reality? Now, why do we want leaders, political or religious: For the obvious reason that we want to be directed, we want to be told what to do or what to think. Our education, our social and religious organizations, are based on that: they tell us, not how to think, but what to think. Naturally, then, you must have leaders. Because you are confused, disintegrating, because you are in misery and do not know what to do, you look to somebody else, to political, religious, or economic leaders, to help you out of this chaotic condition of existence. Now, can any leader, political or religious, lead you out of this misery, out of this confusion? Please, this is a very important question. Because, in leadership is implied power, position, prestige; in leadership is implied exploitation - by the follower as well as by the leader. The leader comes into being because the led want to be led. That is, the follower exploits the leader, and the leader exploits the follower. Without the follower, where is the leader? He is frustrated, he feels lost. And without the leader, where is the follower? So, it is a process of mutual exploitation; and where there is a desire for power, for position, for dominance, for guidance, there is no understanding. Where the leader becomes the authority, the person to whom everything is referred, politically or religiously, then you as the follower become merely the record-player, the automaton; and as most people want to repeat, to look on while the leaders play, the result is that you become unproductive, thoughtless. That is exactly what has happened in the world.

So, our problem is, why do we need leaders? Can anybody, lead you out of your confusion, which you yourself are creating? Others

may point out the causes of your confusion - but surely, they don't become leaders. For example, I am pointing out the cause of confusion, but I am not becoming your leader or your guru. It is for you to perceive and act upon it, or to leave it. But if I made you join an organization, if I became your authority, then I would become important; therefore your confusion would still exist, and you would merely be running away from your confusion and giving emphasis to me; whereas, the emphasis should be laid on your confusion, and not on me. So, I am out of the picture. What is important is to understand your own suffering, your own confusion, your own pain, your own disastrous existence. And to understand, do you need anybody's help? What you need is to look truly, to look with clarity, with eyes that are not biased. And you have to do that for yourself, you have to look within yourself to find out whether you are biased, whether you are prejudiced. That means, you have to be aware of your own process, of your idiosyncracies; but as most of us are unwilling to discover ourselves and go into the process of self-knowledge, we look to a leader - or rather, we create a leader. So, the leader becomes important, because the leader helps us to run away from ourselves. The leader can be worshipped, put away in a cage and whispered about. So, the leader is really a degenerating factor. Surely, when the individual, when a society, when a culture looks to a leader, it indicates a state of disintegration. A society that is creative has no leader, because each individual is a light unto himself. Such a society is the result of relationship between people who are seeking deep, fundamental self-knowledge, understanding; and such people don't require a static society with its leaders, with its authoritarian

social organizations.

Question: By what mechanism do we change the world when we change ourselves?

Krishnamurti: I have said that the individual problem is the world problem; that the individual, with his inner conflicts, with his psychological struggles, with his frustrations, with his anxieties, pursuits, motives, projects these into the world, and in this way the problem of the individual becomes the world problem. Therefore, the world and the individual are not two separate entities; the mass and the individual are interrelated, they are inseparable. When we consider the individual, we are considering the world, the mass, the whole. They cannot be separated. The world is not apart from you, the world is you - not mystically, but actually; biologically and psychologically, in relationship, the world is you. Because, whatever you are - your greeds, your ambitions, your frustrations - , is projected into the world; and however cunningly and subtly the social system may be devised, the inner man always overcomes the outer. Therefore, there must be transformation of the inner - not in opposition to the outer, not in antagonism to the mass, not in separation from the world, but as a total process. The individual and the world are a total process, and to transform the world, you must begin near, with yourself. You cannot transform the world - that has no meaning. The world has no referent; but the individual has a referent, which is me, which is you. Therefore, I can begin with myself - which does not mean opposing individual perfection to the mass. It is very important to understand that we are not discussing individual perfection at all. To seek individual perfection leads to isolation, to



segregation; and nothing can exist in isolation. We are not discussing self-improvement. On the contrary, self-improvement is merely another form of self-enclosure. We are discussing, we are trying to understand, the individual process, which is not separate from the world process. But to understand the world, I must begin somewhere, and I can begin only with that which is near, which is me. So, if that is clear, then we can see the mechanism of change - how, by changing myself, I can transform the world. That is, as long as I am greedy, as long as I am nationalistic, as long as I am acquisitive, I create a society in which greed, acquisitiveness, and nationalism are rampant, which means conflict, ultimately leading to war. Obviously, there can be no mechanism of change as long as I am greedy, as long as I am seeking power, for my actions will inevitably bring about a state of power, political, religious and social power, leading ultimately to conflict. Therefore, being the total process of society" I am responsible for war; and if I wish ardently for peace, if I would concern myself with peace, then I must cease to be greedy, acquisitive, I must have no nationality, I must not belong to any organized religion or to any ideology. I am the total process of the world, and if I change, if I transform myself, I bring about radical transformation in society; but to be free of ideology, to be free from belief - which separates man from man, as the Hindu and the Muslim, the Christian and the Buddhist - , to be free from acquisitiveness, to be free from envy, is very arduous. And a man who wants to understand the whole significance of existence, has to understand himself - not as the individual opposed to society or the mass, but as a total process. That is, he has to be aware of every thought, every feeling, every

action; and in understanding greed - which, as I have explained, is not naming, is not thinking about greed - he puts an end to greed. Such a man will know love; being free from the elements that create antagonism - belief, nationalism, acquisitiveness - , he will be a factor in bringing about a transformation in the world.

Question: What is true and what is false in the theory of reincarnation?

Krishnamurti: I hope that after listening for two hours and ten minutes your minds are still fresh. Are they, Sirs and Ladies? Alright. What we are trying to do here is to think out the problem together - you are not merely listening to a gramophone. I refuse to be a gramophone; but you are accustomed merely to listen, which means that you are really not following at all. You are listening superficially, being charmed by words, and therefore you are not the regenerators or creators of new society. You are the disintegrating factor, Sirs, and that is the calamity; but you don't see the tragedy of it. The world, India included, is on the verge of a precipice, burning, disintegrating rapidly; and a man who merely listens to the leader, accustoming himself to words and remaining a spectator, is contributing to the disaster. So, if I may suggest, don't get accustomed to what I am saying. I don't repeat; I am thinking anew each time I answer a question. If I merely repeated, it would be frightfully boring to me. As I don't want to bore myself with repetition, I am thinking it out afresh - and so must you, if you have the curiosity and the intensity to discover.

Now, what is involved in this question of reincarnation? It is an enormous problem, and we cannot settle it in a few minutes. So, in examining this question, let us look at it without any bias - which

does not mean keeping a so-called open mind. There is no such thing as an open mind: what is needed is an enquiring mind. We must both enquire into this question. Now, in enquiring into it, what is it that we are looking for? We are looking for the truth, not according to your belief or my belief; because, to find the truth of any matter, I can have no belief. I want to find the truth; therefore I am enquiring, laying bare everything involved in this question, not taking shelter behind any particular form of prejudice. That is, I am enquiring honestly, my mind is very honestly trying to find out, therefore it won't be sidetracked either by the Bhagavad Gita, or by the Bible, or by my pet guru. I want to know, and to know I must have the intensity to pursue; and a man who is tethered to a belief, however long the rope, is still held, and therefore he cannot enquire. He can enquire only within the radius of his own bondage, and therefore he will never find truth.

So, what is the thing implied in reincarnation? What is the thing that reincarnates? You understand what is meant by reincarnation: coming back over and over again in different forms at different times. What is this continuous quality that comes into rebirth? There are only two possibilities: either that thing called the soul, the 'I', is a spiritual entity, or it is merely a bundle of my memories, my characteristics, my tendencies, my unfulfilled desires, my achievements, and so on. We are looking into the problem, we are not taking sides; therefore we are not defending anything. A man who is on the defensive will never know what is truth. He will find that which he defends, and that which he defends is no longer the truth; it is his own inclination, his own bias, his own prejudice.

Now, we are going to examine that which we call the spiritual

entity. The spiritual entity, obviously, cannot be created by me. It is not the outcome of my mind, of my thought, of my projection. It must be independent of me. The spiritual entity, if it is spiritual, cannot be created by me. It must be other than me. Now, if it is other than me, it must be timeless, it must be the eternal, it must be the real; and that which is the real, that which is timeless, that which is immeasurable, cannot evolve, grow. It cannot come back. It is beyond time, therefore it is deathless. Now, if it is deathless, if it is beyond me, then I have no control over it, it is not within the field of my consciousness; therefore I cannot think about it, I cannot enquire if it can or cannot reincarnate. Obviously, that which is beyond my control, I cannot enquire into. I can enquire only into that which I know, which is my own projection; and if the spiritual entity, which I call Krishnamurti, is beyond me, then it is timeless, then I cannot think about it; and what I cannot think about has no reality for me. Therefore, since it is timeless and deathless, and as I am concerned with death, with time, I cannot enquire into it. Therefore, I need not be bothered. But we are bothered. What we are bothered about is not the continuance of a spiritual entity, but whether the `I' continues, the everyday `I' of my achievements, my failures, my frustrations, my bank account, my characteristics and idiosyncracies, my property, my family, my beliefs - will all that continue? That is what we want to know - not whether the spiritual entity continues, which, as I pointed out, is an absurd question, Because, reality, timeless being, cannot be known to a person who is caught in the net of time. As thought is the process of time, as thought is founded on the past, for thought to speculate about the timeless is utterly meaningless. It is an escape. That

which is the result of time can only know itself, can only enquire into itself.

So, I want to know if the `I' continues. The `I', which is a total process, a psychological as well as physiological process, which is with the body and also apart from the body - I want to know if that `I' continues, if it comes into being after this physical existence ends. Now, what do we mean by continuity? We have examined more or less what we mean by the `I: my name, my characteristics, my frustrations, my achievements - you know, all the varieties of thought and feeling at different levels of consciousness. So, we know that. Then, what do we mean by continuity; to continue, what does it mean? What is it that gives continuity? What is it that says, `I shall or shall not continue'? What is it that is clinging to continuity, permanency, which is security? After all, I seek security here in possessions, in things, in family, in beliefs; and when the body dies, the permanency of things, the permanency of family, has gone, but the permanency of idea continues. So, it is the idea that we want to continue. We see that property is going to disappear, that there will be no family; but we want to know whether the idea continues, whether the idea of `I', the thought `I am', is continuous. Please, it is important to see the difference. I know that I shall be burnt, that the body will be destroyed. I know that I shall not see you, that I shall not see my family; but does not the idea of the `me' continue to exist? Is not the idea of `me' continuous - continuous meaning becoming, moving from time to time, from period to period, from experience to experience. So, that is the real enquiry: whether the `I', the idea or formulation of the `me', will continue. Are you not tired? Alright, Sirs.

So, what is the 'I'? We have enquired into that, and you know what it is. Obviously, thought identifies itself with a belief, and that belief continues like an electric wave. Thought, identified with a belief, has continuity, has substance; that thought is termed, is named, it is given recognition as the 'I', and that 'I' obviously has movement, it continues, becomes. Now, what happens to that which continues? Do you understand the problem? What happens to a thing that is continuous constantly becoming? That which continues has no renewal; it is merely repeating itself in different forms, but it has no renewal. That is, thought identified with an idea has continuance as the 'I'; but a thing that continues is constantly decaying, it knows birth and death. In that sense it continues, but the thing that continues can never renew itself. There is renewal only when there is an ending. Again, it is very important to discover and to understand this. Say, for example, I am worried over a problem which I am trying to solve, and I keep on worrying. What happens? There is no renewal, is there? The problem continues day after day, week after week, year after year. But when the worry is ended, there is a renewal, and then the problem has a different significance. Only in ending is there renewal, only in death is there a rebirth - which means death to the day, to the moment. But when there is merely the desire to continue and therefore identification with a belief, or with a memory, which is the 'I', in such continuance there is no renewal - which is an obvious fact. A man who has a problem, who is continuously worried for a number of years, is dead, for him there is no renewal; he is of the living dead, he merely continues. But the moment the problem ends, there is a renewal. Similarly, where

there is ending, there is rebirth, there is creation; but where there is continuity, there is no creation. Sirs, see the beauty of it, the truth of it, that in ending there is love. Love is new from moment to moment, it is not continuous, it is not repetitive. That is its greatness, that is its truth. A man who seeks continuity will obviously find it, because he identifies himself with an idea, and idea or memory continues; but in mere continuity there is no renewal. Only in death, in ending, is there renewal, not in continuity.

Now, you will say that I have not answered the question whether there is reincarnation or not. Surely, I have answered your question. Sir, to the problems of life there are no categorical answers `yes' and `no'. Life is too vast. It is only the thoughtless who seek a categorical answer. But, analyzing this question, we have discovered a great many things. There is beauty only in ending, there is renewal, creation, a beginning, only in death, in dying every minute - which means not hoarding, not laying up, physically or psychologically. So, life and death are one, and the man who knows they are one is he who dies every minute. This means not naming, not letting the record-keeper play over and over again that which is his particular consciousness. Immortality is not the continuance of an idea, which is the `I'. Immortality is that which is constantly dying and therefore constantly renewing.

February 29, 1948

## **BOMBAY 8TH PUBLIC TALK 7TH MARCH, 1948**

We must often have wondered why life from birth to death is a process of constant struggle. Why is it that life, everyday existence is such a struggle, a constant battle with oneself, with one's neighbour, with one's ideas? Why this constant battle, this constant struggle? Is it necessary, or is there a different process? This conflict and struggle, this travail and battle with oneself and with one's neighbour, is it necessary for existence, for living? We see that life as we know it is an endless process of becoming, moving from what is to what is not, from anger to non-anger, from violence to peace, from hatred to love. Surely, becoming is a process of repetition in which there is always strife. We see that whatever we do in life, the struggle of becoming is continually repeating itself. This becoming is the cultivation of memory, is it not; and the cultivation of memory is called righteousness, Righteousness is a process of self-enclosure. This constant becoming - the clerk becoming the manager, the ignoble becoming the noble - , this constant strife, is a form of self-perpetuation.. We know this battle to become something: being attached, we want to become detached; being poor we want to become rich; being small, we want to become great; being petty, we seek to be deep, profound, worthwhile. There is this constant battle of becoming, and in becoming there is obviously the cultivation of memory. Without memory there is no becoming. I am angry, and I want to become non-angry; I want to possess the state of non-anger, and I struggle. This struggle is considered righteous. So, righteousness, this process of becoming, is obviously one of self-enclosure. The



moment I wish to become something or to be something, emphasis is laid on the becoming, on the being; and hence there is this struggle. To this struggle we have given significance. We say it is righteous, it is noble. So, from birth to death we are caught in an endless struggle, and we have accepted this battle of becoming as worthwhile, as noble, as an essential part of existence.

Now, is life, existence, inevitably a process of struggle, pain, sorrow, a continuous battle? Surely, there is something wrong in this action of becoming, There must be a different approach, a different way of existence. I think there is; but it can be understood only when we understand the full significance of becoming. In becoming there is always repetition, and therefore the cultivation of memory, which is emphasis on the self, and the self in its very nature is travail, strife, battle. Now, virtue can never be a becoming. Virtue is being, in which there is no struggle. You cannot become virtuous; either you are, or you are not virtuous. You can always become righteous, but you can never become virtuous; because, virtue brings freedom, and you will notice that a righteous man is never free. This does not mean that a virtuous man is self-indulgent; but virtue, by its very nature, brings freedom, If you attempt to be virtuous, what happens? You merely become, righteous. Whereas, virtue necessarily brings freedom; because the moment you understand the process, the struggle of becoming, there is being, and therefor there is virtue.

Take, for example, mercy. You can never become merciful, can you? If you do, what happens? If you struggle to become merciful, if you try to become generous, kindly, what happens? In trying to become merciful, emphasis is laid on becoming, which means that

emphasis is laid on the self - the `me' becoming something, and the `me' can never be merciful, can it? It can be clothed in righteousness, but it can never be virtuous. So, virtue is not righteousness; the righteous man can never be a virtuous man. Righteousness is always a process of self-enclosure; whereas virtue, in which there is no becoming, but being, is always free, open and orderly. Experiment with yourself and you will see that the moment you strive to become virtuous, merciful, generous, you are merely building a resistance; whereas, if you really understand the process of becoming, which is giving emphasis to the self, then you will find that there comes a confidence, a freedom, a being in which there is virtue.

Now, how is one to transform, to bring about this radical change from becoming to being? A person who is becoming and therefore striving, struggling, battling with himself - how is such a person to know that state of being which is virtue, which is freedom? I hope I am making the question clear. That is, I have been struggling for years to become something, not to be envious, to become non-envious; and how am I to shed, to drop the struggle, and just be? Because, as long as I struggle to become what I call righteous, I am obviously setting up a process of self enclosure; and there is no freedom in enclosure. So, all that I can do is to be aware, passively aware of my process of becoming. If I am shallow, I can be passively aware that I am shallow, without the struggle to become something. If I am angry, if I am jealous, if I am unmerciful, envious, I can just be aware of that and not contend with it. The moment we contend with a quality, we give emphasis to the struggle, and therefore strengthen the wall of resistance. This wall

of resistance is considered righteousness; but for a righteous man, truth can never come into being. It is only to the free man that truth can come; and to be free, there cannot be the cultivation of memory, which is righteousness.

So, one has to be aware of this struggle, of this constant battle. Just be aware without contention, without condemnation; and if you are truly watchful, passively yet alertly aware, you will find that envy, jealousy, greed, violence and all these things, drop away, and there comes order - quietly, speedily, there comes order that is not righteous, that is not enclosing. For virtue is freedom, it is not a process of enclosure. It is only in freedom that truth can come into being. Therefore, it is essential to be virtuous, not righteous, because virtue brings order. It is only the righteous man that is confused, that is in conflict, it is only the righteous man that develops his will as a means of resistance; and a man of will can never find truth, because he is never free. Being, which is recognizing what is, accepting and living with what is - not trying to transform it, not condemning it - , brings about virtue; and in that there is freedom. Only when the mind is not cultivating memory, when it is not seeking righteousness as a means of resistance, is there freedom; and in that freedom there comes reality, the bliss of which must be experienced.

Question: Are not religious symbols the expression of a reality too deep to be false? The simple name of God moves us as nothing else. Why should we shun it?

Krishnamurti: Why do we need symbols? Symbols exist, obviously, as a means of communicating with others; through language, a painting, a poem, you communicate something which

you feel or which you think. But why need we crowd our lives with religious symbols - either the cross, the crescent, or the Hindu symbols? Why do we need them? Are not symbols a hindrance? Why can't we experience what is, directly, immediately and swiftly? Why do we seek the medium of symbols? Are they not distractions? An image, a painting, a thing made by the hand, of wood or stone, though it is a symbol, is it not a hindrance? You will say, I need an image as a symbol of reality. Now, what happens when you have symbols? The Hindus have their symbols, the Christians theirs, and the Muslims theirs - the temple, the church, the mosque, with the result that the symbols have become much more important than the search for reality. And surely, reality is not in the symbol. The word is not the thing; God is not the word. But the word, the symbol, has become important. Why? Because we are really not seeking reality: we merely decorate the symbol. We are not seeking; what is beyond and above the symbol, with the result that the symbol has become extraordinarily important, vital in our lives - and we are willing to kill each other for it. Also, the word 'God' gives us a certain stimulation, and we think that that stimulation, that sensation, has some relation to the real. But has sensation, which is a thought process, any relationship to reality? Thought is the outcome of memory, the response to a condition; and has such a thought process any connection with reality, which is not a thought process? Therefore, has a symbol, which is the creation of the mind, any relationship to reality? And is not a symbol an easy escape, a fanciful distraction from the real? After all, if you are really seeking truth, why do you want the symbol? It is the man who is satisfied with an image that clings to

the symbol; but if he wants to find what is real, obviously he must leave the symbol. We crowd our lives, our minds, with symbols, because we have not the other. If we love, surely, we do not want the symbol of love, or the example of love - we just love. But the man who holds an example, a symbol, a picture, an ideal in his mind, is obviously not in a state of love. Therefore, symbols, examples, are hindrances, and these hindrances become so important, that we are killing others and maiming our minds and hearts because of them. Sir, why not appreciate things directly? One loves a person, or a tree, not because of what it represents, not because it is the manifestation of reality, of life, or of anything else - that is merely an easy explanation. One just loves. Surely, when one is able to love life itself, not because it is the manifestation of reality, then in that very love of life one will find what is real. But if you treat life as a manifestation of something else, then you abominate life; then you want to run away from life, or you make life a hideous business, which necessitates your escape from the actual. Besides, a mind that is caught in symbols is not a simple mind. And you must have a very simple, clear mind, an unpolluted, uncorrupted mind, to find the real. A mind that is caught in words, in phrases, in mantrams, in patterns of action, can never understand that which is real. It must strip itself of everything to be free, and only then, surely, can the real come into being.

Question: What do you advise us to do when war breaks out?

Krishnamurti: Instead of seeking advice, may I suggest that we examine the problem together? Because, it is very easy to advise, but it does not solve the problem. But if we examine the problem together, then perhaps we shall be able to see how to act when a

war breaks out. It has to be a direct action, not action based on somebody else's advice or authority, which would be too stupid in a moment of crisis. In moments of crisis, to follow another leads to our own destruction. After all, in critical times like war, you are led to destruction; but if you know all the implications of war and see its action, how it comes into being, then when the crisis does arise, without seeking advice, without following somebody, you will act directly and truly. This does not mean that I am trying to avoid the problem by not answering your question directly. I am not dodging it: on the contrary. I am showing that we can act virtuously - which is not 'righteously' - when this appalling catastrophe comes upon man. Now, what would you do if there was a war? Being a Hindu, or an Indian, or a German, being nationalistic, patriotic, you would naturally jump to arms, wouldn't you? Because, through propaganda, through horrible pictures and all the rest of it, you would be stimulated, and you would be ready to fight. Being conditioned by patriotism, by nationalism, by economic frontiers, by the so-called love of country, your immediate response would be to fight. So, you would have no problem, would you? You have a problem only when you begin to question the causes of war - which are not merely economic, but much more psychological and ideological. When you begin to question the whole process of war, how war comes into being, then you have to be directly responsible for your actions. Because, war comes into being only when you, in your relationship with another, create conflict. After all, war is a projection of our daily life - only more spectacular and more destructive. In daily life we are killing, destroying, maiming thousands through our greed, through our nationalism, through our

economic frontiers, and so on. So, war is the continuation of your daily existence, made more spectacular; and the moment you directly question the cause of war, you are questioning your relationship with another, which means that you are questioning your whole existence, your whole way of living. And if you enquire intelligently, not superficially, when war comes you will respond according to your enquiry and understanding. A man who is peaceful - not because of an ideal of non-violence, which we have gone into, but - , who is actually free of violence, to him war has no meaning. He will obviously not enter it; he may be shot because he does not enter into war, but he accepts the consequences. At least he will not take part in the conflict - but not out of idealism. The idealist, as I have explained, is a person who avoids immediate action. The idealist who is seeking non-violence is incapable of being free from violence; because, as our whole life is based on conflict and violence, if I don't understand myself now, today, how can I act truly tomorrow when there is a calamity? Being acquisitive, being conditioned by nationalism, by my class - you know the whole process - , how can I, who am conditioned by greed and violence, act without greed and violence when there is a catastrophe? Naturally I will be violent. Also, when there is a war, many like the bounties of war: the government is going to look after me, it is going to feed my family; and it is a break from my daily routine, from going to the office, from the monotonous things of life. Therefore, war is an escape, and to many it offers an easy way out of responsibility. Have you not heard what many soldiers say? 'Thank God. It is a beastly business, but at least it is something exciting.' Also, war offers a release to our criminal

instincts. We are criminal in our daily life, in our business world, in our relationships, but it is all underground, very carefully hidden, covered over by a righteous blanket, a legalised acceptance of this criminality; and war gives us a release from that hypocrisy - at last we can be violent.

So, how you will act in time of war depends upon you, upon the condition, the state of your being. To say, 'You must not enter war' to a man who is conditioned to violence, is utterly useless. It is a futile waste of time to tell him not to fight, because he is conditioned to fight, he loves to fight. But those of us who are seriously intentioned can investigate our own lives, we can see how we are violent in daily life, in our speech, in our thoughts, in our actions, in our feelings, and we can be free of that violence, not because of an ideal not by trying to transform it into nonviolence, but by actually facing it, by merely being aware of it; then when war comes, we shall be able to act truly. A man who is seeking an ideal will act falsely, because his response will be based on frustration. Whereas, if we are capable of being aware of our own thoughts, feelings and actions in daily life - not condemning them, but just being aware of them - , then we will free ourselves from patriotism, from nationalism, from flag-waving, and all that rot, which are the very symbols of violence; and when we are free, then we will know how to act truly when that crisis comes which is called war.

Question: Can a man who abhors violence take part in the government of a country?

Krishnamurti: Now, what is government? After all, it is, it represents, what we are. In so-called democracy, whatever that



may mean, we elect, to represent us, those who are like ourselves, those whom we like, who have got the loudest voice, the cleverest mind, or whatever it is. So, obviously, government is what we are, isn't it? And what are we? We are, aren't we?, a mass of conditioned responses - violence, greed, acquisitiveness, envy, desire for power, and so on. So, naturally, the government is what we are, which is violence in different forms; and how can a man who really has no violence in his being belong, either in name or in fact, to a structure which is violent? Can reality co-exist with violence, which is what we call government? Can a man who is seeking or experiencing reality have anything to do with sovereign governments, with nationalism, with an ideology, with party politics, with a system of power? The peaceful person thinks that by joining the government he will be able to do some good. But what happens when he enters government? The structure is so powerful that he is absorbed by it, and he can do very little. Sir, this is a fact, it is actually happening in the world. When you join a party, or stand for election to parliament, or whatever it is, you have to accept the party line. Therefore, you cease to think. And how can a man who has given himself over to another - whether it is to a party, to a government, or to a guru - , how can he find reality? And how can he who is seeking truth have any relation to power politics?

You see, we ask these questions because we like to rely on outside authority, on environment, for the transformation of ourselves. We hope leaders, governments, parties, systems, patterns of action, will somehow transform us, bring about order and peace in our lives. Surely, that is the basis of all these

questions, is it not? Can another, be it a government or a guru or a devil, give you peace and order? Can another bring you happiness and love? Surely not. Peace can come into being only when the confusion which we have created is completely understood, not on the verbal level, but inwardly; when the causes of confusion, of strife, are removed, obviously there is peace and freedom. But without removing the causes, we look to some outward authority to bring us peace; and the outward is always submerged by the inner. As long as the psychological conflict exists, the search for power, for position, and so on, whatever the outward structure, however well built, however good and orderly it may be, the inward confusion always overcomes it. Surely, therefore, we must lay emphasis on the inner, and not merely look to the outer.

Question: You don't seem to think that we have won our independence. According to you, what would be the state of real freedom?

Krishnamurti: Sir, freedom becomes isolation when it is nationalistic; and isolation inevitably leads to conflict, because nothing can exist in isolation. To be, is to be related; and merely to isolate yourself within a national frontier invites confusion, sorrow, starvation, conflict, war - which has been proved over and over again. So, independence as a State apart inevitably leads to conflict and to war, because independence for most of us implies isolation. And when you have isolated yourself as a national entity, have you gained freedom? Have you gained freedom from exploitation, from class struggle, from starvation, from conflicting religiosity, from the priest, from communal strife, from leadership? Obviously, you have not. You have only driven out the white exploiter, and the

brown has taken his place - probably a little more ruthlessly. We have the same thing as before, the same exploitation, the same priests, the same organized religion, the same superstitions and class wars. And has that given us freedom? Sir, we don't want to be free. Don't let us fool ourselves. Because, freedom implies intelligence, love; freedom implies non-exploitation, non-submission to authority; freedom implies extraordinary virtue. As I said, righteousness is always an isolating process, for isolation and righteousness go together; whereas, virtue and freedom are co-existent. A sovereign nation is always isolated, and therefore can never be free; therefore it is a cause of constant strife, of suspicion, antagonism and war.

Surely, freedom must begin with the individual, who is a total process, not antagonistic to the mass. The individual is the total process of the world, and if he merely isolates himself in nationalism or in righteousness, then he is the cause of disaster and misery. But if the individual - who is a total process, not opposed to the mass, but who is a result of the mass, of the whole - if the individual transforms himself, his life, then for him there is freedom; and because he is the result of a total process, when he liberates himself from nationalism, from greed, from exploitation, he has direct action upon the whole. The regeneration of the individual is not in the future, but now; and if you postpone your regeneration to tomorrow, you are inviting confusion, you are caught in the wave of darkness. Regeneration is now, not tomorrow, because understanding is only in the present. You don't understand now because you don't give your heart and mind, your whole attention, to that which you want to understand. If you give

your mind and heart to understand, you will have understanding. Sir, if you give your mind and your heart to find out the cause of violence, if you are fully aware of it, you will be non-violent now. But unfortunately, you have so conditioned your mind by religious postponement and social ethics that you are incapable of looking at it directly - and that is our trouble.

So, understanding is always in the present, and never in the future. Understanding is now, not in the days to come. And freedom, which is not isolation, can come into being only when each one of us understands his responsibility to the whole. The individual is the product of the whole - he is not a separate process, he is the result of the whole. After all, you are the result of all India, of all humanity. You may call yourself by whatever name you like, but you are the result of a total process, which is man. And if you, the psychological you, are not free, how can you have freedom outwardly; of what significance is external freedom? You may have different governors - and good God, is that freedom? You may have the multiplication of provinces, because each person wants a job; but is that freedom? Sir, we are fed by words without much content; we darken the councils with words that have no meaning; we have fed on propaganda, which is a lie. We have not thought out these problems for ourselves, because most of us want to be led. We don't want to think and find out, because to think is very painful, very disillusioning. Either we think and become disillusioned and cynical - or we think and go beyond. When you go beyond and above all thought process, then there is freedom. And in that there is joy, in that there is creative being, which a righteous man, an isolated man, can never understand.

Question: My mind is restless and distressed. Without getting it under control, I can do nothing about myself. How am I to control thought?

Krishnamurti: Sir this is an enormous problem; and, as with all other problems of life, we will not find a method for its solution. But we will try to understand the problem itself, and out of that understanding we shall know how to deal with the question. First, we must understand thought, which the thinker wants to control. I hope this is not too serious a subject. What do we mean by thought? What do we mean by thinking? And, is the thinker separate from his thought? Is the meditator different from his meditation? Is the observer different, separate from the observed? Is the quality different from the self? So, before thought can be controlled, whatever that may mean, we must understand the process of thinking and who it is that thinks, and find out whether these are two separate processes, or one unitary process.

Does the thinker exist when he ceases to think? When there are no thoughts, is there a thinker? Obviously, if you have no thoughts, there is no thinker. And why is there the separation between the thinker and the thought? With most of us, there is this separation. Why is there this separation? Is it factual, is it true, or merely a fictitious thing which the mind has created? We must be very clear on this point, because then we shall enquire into what the thought process is. First, we must be very clear as to whether the thinker is separate, and why he has separated himself from his thoughts. Then we shall go into the problem of thinking and controlling, and all the rest of it.

Arn't you under the belief that your thoughts are separate from

yourself? This very question implies that, doesn't it? - that there is the controller and the controlled, the observer and the observed. Now, do we know this process to be a fact, that there is the observer and the observed, the controller and the controlled? Is this separation real? It is real in the sense that we are indulging in it. But is it not a trick of the mind? Please, in this question a great deal is involved, so don't accept or deny, don't defend or put aside what I am suggesting. Most of you believe that the thinker is separate, the higher self, the Atman, the watcher, dominating the lower self, and so on. Why is there this separation? Isn't this separation still within the field of the mind? When you say the thinker is the Atman, the watcher, and the thoughts are separate, surely that is still within the field of the mind. Now, is it not that the mind, the thinker, has separated himself from his thoughts in order to give himself permanency? Because he can always modify his thoughts, he can always change his thoughts, put a new frame around them, while he remains apart and therefore gives himself permanency. But without the thoughts, the thinker is not. He may separate himself from his thoughts, but if he ceases to think, he no longer exists, does he? So, this separation of the thinker from his thoughts is a trick of the thinker to give himself security, permanency. That is, the mind perceives that thoughts are transient, and therefore it adopts the cunning trick of saying that it is the thinker apart from its thoughts, it is the Atman, the watcher, apart from action, from thought. But, if you observe the process very closely, putting aside all your acquired knowledge of what others have said, however great, then you will see that the observer is the observed, that the thinker is the thought. There is no thinker apart from thought;

however widely, deeply and extensively he may separate himself or build a wall between himself and his thoughts, the thinker is still within the field of his thinking. Therefore, the thinker is the thought; so when you ask, 'How can thought be controlled?', you are putting a wrong question. When the thinker begins to control his thoughts, he does so merely to give himself continuity, or because he finds his thoughts are painful to him. Therefore, he wants to modify his thoughts, while he remains permanent behind the screen of words and thoughts. When once you admit that, which is true, then your disciplines, your pursuit of the higher, your meditations, your controls, all collapse. That is, if you are willing to look at the obvious fact that the thinker is the thought, and when you become fully aware of that fact, then you no longer think in terms of dominating, modifying, controlling, or canalizing your thoughts. Then the thought becomes important, and not the thinker. The emphasis then is not on the controller and how to control, but the thought which is controlled becomes important in itself. Understanding the thought process is the beginning of meditation, which is self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge, there is no meditation; and meditation of the heart is understanding. To understand, you cannot be tethered to any belief.

So, we are now concerned, not with controlling thought, which is a false question, but with the understanding of thought; we are concerned with the thought process itself. Therefore, we are free of the idea of discipline, of the idea of control - which is an extraordinary revolution, isn't it? You can be free only when you see the truth of the falseness of the belief that the thinker is separate from his thoughts. That is, when you see the truth about

the false, then there is freedom from the false. We have for a long period accepted the idea that the thinker is separate from his thoughts; and now we see that the separation is false. Therefore, seeing the truth about the false, you are free of the false, with all its implications - disciplining, controlling, guiding, canalizing thought, putting thought into a definite pattern of action. When you do all that, you are still concerned with the thinker; therefore the thinker and the thought will remain separate, which is a false thing. But when you see the falseness of all that, it drops away from you, and there is only thought left. Then you can enquire into thought, then the mind is merely the machine of the thought process, and the thinker is not apart from the thought.

Now, the mind is the recorder, the experiencer, and therefore the mind is memory, sensuous memory; because the mind is the result of the senses. So, thought which is the product of the mind, is sensuous; obviously, thought is the result of sensation. Mind is the recorder, the accumulating factor, the consciousness which is experiencing naming, and recording. That is, the mind experiences, then names the experience as pleasant or unpleasant, and then records it, puts it in the pigeon-hole which is memory. That memory responds to a new challenge. Challenge is always new, and memory, which is merely a record of the past, meets the new. This meeting of the new by the old is called experiencing. Now, memory has no life in itself. It has life, it is revived, only in meeting the new. Therefore, the new is always giving life to the old. That is, when memory meets the challenge, which is always new, it derives life, it strengthens itself from that experience. Examine your own memory and you will see that it has no vitality



in itself; but when memory meets the new and translates the new according to its own conditioning, then it is revived. So, memory has life only as it meets the new, always revivifying, always strengthening itself. This revivification of memory is called thinking. Please, it is very important to understand all this, but I don't know how much you want to go into it.

So, thinking is always a conditioned response, thinking is a process of response to a challenge. The challenge is always new; but thinking, which is a response derived from memory, is always the old revived. It is very important to understand this. Thinking can never be new, because thinking is the response of memory, and this response of memory becomes vital when it meets the new and derives life from the new. But thinking in itself is never new. Therefore, thinking can never be creative, because it is always the response of memory. Now, our minds, our thoughts, are wandering all over the place, and we want to bring about order. As I have explained, this cannot be done by control; because, the moment you control it, your mind becomes exclusive, isolated. If you merely emphasize one thought and exclude all others, there is an isolating process going on. Therefore, such a mind can never be free. It can isolate itself, but isolation is not freedom. A controlled mind is not a free mind.

So, our problem is that our thoughts wander all over the place, and naturally we want to bring about order; but how is order to be brought about? Now, to understand a fast evolving machine, you must slow it down, must you not? If you want to understand a dynamo, it must be slowed down and studied; but if you stop it, it is a dead thing, and a dead thing can never be understood. Only a

living thing can be understood. So, a mind that has killed thoughts by exclusion, by isolation, can have no understanding; but the mind can understand thought if the thought process is slowed down. If you have seen a slow motion picture, you will understand the marvellous movement of a horse's muscles as it jumps. There is beauty in that slow movement of the muscles; but as the horse jumps hurriedly, as the movement is quickly over, that beauty is lost. Similarly, when the mind moves slowly because it wants to understand each thought as it arises, then there is freedom from thinking, freedom from controlled, disciplined thought. Thinking is the response of memory, therefore thinking can never be creative. Only in meeting the new as the new, the fresh as the fresh, is there creative being. The mind is the recorder, the gatherer of memories; and as long as memory is being revived by challenge, the thought process must go on. But if each thought is observed, felt out, gone into fully, and completely understood, then you will find that memory begins to wither away. We are talking about psychological memory, not factual memory.

Thought, which is the response of memory, arises only when an experience has not been completely understood, and therefore leaves a residue. When you understand an experience completely, it leaves no memory, no psychological residue. Thought is the response of the residue, which is memory; and if you can complete a thought, think it out, feel it out to its fullest extent, then its residue is done away with. To fully think out a thought, a feeling, is very arduous; because when you begin to think out one thought, other thoughts creep in. So, you go round, pursuing one thought after another hopelessly, because of the rapidity of each thought.

But if you are interested to think out one thought fully, experiment with writing out the thoughts that arise; just put them down on paper, and then observe what you have written. In that observation, your mind is slowed, because to study, it has to slow down - which is not a compulsion, not a discipline. When you write down only a few of your thoughts and observe them, study them, your mind is immediately slowed. Watch your own mind now as you listen, see what it is doing. It is moving very slowly. You have not innumerable thoughts, you are merely pursuing one thought, which I am explaining. Therefore, your mind is slowed down, and being slowed down, it is capable of pursuing one thought to the end. When all thought is pursued to the end and the mind denuded of memory, the mind becomes tranquil, it has no problem. Why? Because the creator of the problem, which is memory, ceases; and in that tranquillity, which is absolute, reality comes into being. This whole process, which we have discovered this evening with regard to this particular question, is meditation. Meditation is self-knowledge, which is the basis of true thinking; and when there is true thinking, there is understanding, and so right action. But meditation becomes imitative, it has no meaning, when the thinker is not understood. When the thinker separates himself from his thoughts and seeks to control them, he is progressing towards illusion; whereas, seeing the truth in the false liberates you from the false. Then there is only thought left and in understanding thought fully, there comes tranquillity. In that tranquillity, there is creation; that is, when the mind ceases to create, there is a creation which is beyond time, which is immeasurable, which is the real.

March 7, 1948

## **BOMBAY 9TH PUBLIC TALK 13TH MARCH, 1948**

(Although open to all, today's meeting was convened especially for the benefit of educationists and teachers. It was presided over by a member of the New Education Fellowship, who welcomed Krishnamurti on behalf of his institution and thanked him for doing them the honour to attend. He then requested him to give them the benefit of his advice in the matter of education.)

Krishnamurti: Mr. Chairman and friends: I have been sent many questions, and I propose to answer as many of them as possible this evening. All these questions have been rewritten, but their substance has been kept. Some questions were repeated, and we thought it would be better to combine and rewrite them, and there are about 15 or 16 questions here. But before I answer them, I would like to say something.

Throughout the world, it is becoming more and more evident that the educator needs educating. It is not a question of educating the child, but rather the educator, for he needs it much more than the pupil. After all, the pupil is like a tender plant that needs guiding, helping; but if the helper is himself incapable, narrow, bigoted, nationalistic and all the rest of it, naturally his product will be what he is. So, it seems to me that the important thing is not so much the technique of what to teach, which is secondary; but what is of primary importance is the intelligence of the educator himself. You know that, throughout the world, education has failed, because it has produced the two most colossal and destructive wars in history; and since it has failed, merely to substitute one system for

another seems to me to be utterly futile. Whereas, if there is a possibility of changing the thought, the feeling, the attitude of the teacher, then perhaps there can be a new culture, a new civilization. Because, it is obvious that this civilization is likely to be destroyed completely; the coming war will probably settle Western civilization as we know it. Perhaps we shall be profoundly affected by it in this country also. But in the midst of all this chaos, misery, confusion and strife, surely the responsibility of the teacher, whether he is a government employee, whether he is a religious teacher or a teacher of mere information, is extraordinarily great; and those who merely fatten on education as a means of livelihood seem to me to have no place in the modern structure of society if a new order is to be created. So, our problem is not so much the child, the boy or the girl, but the teacher, the educator, who needs educating much more than the pupil. And to educate the educator is far more difficult than to educate the child, because the educator is already set, fixed. He merely functions in a routine, because he is really not concerned with the thought process, with the cultivation of intelligence. He is merely imparting information; and a man who merely imparts information when the whole world is crashing about his ears, is surely not an educator. And do you mean to say that education is a means of livelihood? To regard it as a means of livelihood, to exploit the children for one's own good, seems to me so contrary to the real purpose of education.

So, in answering all these questions, the principal point is the educator, and not the child. You can provide the right environment, the necessary tools, and all the rest of it; but what is important is

for the educator himself to find out what all this existence means. Why are we living, why are we striving, why are we educating, why are there wars, why is there communal strife between man and man? To study this whole problem, and to bring our intelligence into operation, is surely the function of a real teacher. The teacher who does not demand anything for himself, who does not use teaching as a means of acquiring position, power, authority; the teacher who is really teaching, not for profit, not along a certain line, but who is giving, growing, awakening intelligence in the child because he is cultivating intelligence in himself - surely such a teacher has the primary place in civilization. Because, after all, all great civilizations have been founded on the teachers, not on engineers and technicians. The engineers and technicians are absolutely necessary, but those who awaken the moral, the ethical intelligence, are obviously of primary importance; and they can have moral integrity, freedom from the desire for power, position, authority, only when they don't ask anything for themselves, when they are beyond and above society and are not under the control of governments; and when they are free from the compulsion of social action, which is always action according to a pattern.

So, a teacher must be beyond the limits of society and its demands, so as to be able to create a new culture, a new structure, a new civilization. But at present we are merely concerned with the technique of how to educate a boy or girl, without cultivating the intelligence of the teacher - which seems to me so utterly futile. We are now mostly concerned with learning a technique and imparting that technique to the child, and not with the cultivation of intelligence which will help him to deal with the problems of

life. So, when I answer these questions, I hope you will bear with me if I don't go into any particular detail, but deal primarily, not with technique, but with the right approach to the problem.

Question: What part can education play in the present world crisis?

Krishnamurti: First of all, to understand what part education can play in the present world crisis, we must understand how the crisis has come into being. Without understanding that, merely to build on the same values, on the same ground, on the same foundation, will bring about further wars, further disasters. So, we must first investigate how the present crisis has come into being, and in understanding the causes we will inevitably understand what kind of education we need.

Obviously, the present crisis is the result of wrong values - wrong values in man's relationship to property, to people, and to ideas. The expansion and predominance of sensate values necessarily creates the poison of nationalism, economic frontiers, sovereign governments and the patriotic spirit, all of which excludes man's cooperation with man for the benefit of man, and corrupts his relationship with people, which is society. And if the individual's relationship with others is wrong, the structure of society is bound to collapse. Similarly, in his relationship to ideas, man justifies an ideology - whether of the left or of the right, whether the means employed are right or wrong - in order to achieve an end. So, mutual distrust, lack of goodwill, the belief that a right end can be achieved by wrong means, the sacrificing of the present for a future ideal - all these are obviously causes of the present disaster. One cannot take time to go into all the details, but

one can see at a glance how this chaos, this degradation, has come into being. Surely, it all arises from wrong values and from dependence on authority, on leaders, whether in daily life, in the small school, or the big university. Leaders and authority are deteriorating factors in any culture. The moment you depend on another, there is no self-dependence, and where there is no self-dependence, obviously there must be conformity, eventually leading to the dictatorship of totalitarian states.

So, realizing all these things, realizing the causes of war, of this present catastrophe, of the present moral and social crisis, seeing both the causes and the results, naturally one begins to perceive that the function of education is to create new values, not merely to implant existing values in the mind of the pupil, which merely conditions him without awakening his intelligence. But when the educator himself has not seen the causes of the present chaos, how can he create new values, how can he awaken intelligence, how can he prevent the coming generation from following in the same steps leading ultimately to still further disaster? Surely, then, it is important for the educator, not merely to implant certain ideals and convey mere information, but to give all his thought, all his care, all his affection, to creating the right environment, the right atmosphere, so that when the child grows up into maturity he is capable of dealing with any human problem that confronts him. So, education is intimately related to the present world crisis; and all the educators, at least in Europe and America, are realizing that the crisis is the outcome of wrong education. Education can be transformed only by educating the educator, and not merely creating a new pattern, a new system of action.



Question: Have ideals any place in education?

Krishnamurti: Certainly not. Ideals and the idealist in education prevent the comprehension of the present. This is an enormous problem, and we are going to try to deal with it in 5 or 10 minutes. It is a problem upon which our whole structure is based. That is, we have ideals, and according to those ideals we educate. Now, are ideals necessary for education? Don't ideals actually prevent right education, which is the understanding of the child as he is and not as he should be? If I want to understand a child, I must not have an ideal of what he should be. To understand him, I must study him as he is. But to put him into the framework of an ideal is merely to force him to follow a certain pattern, whether it suits him or not; and the result is that he is always in contradiction to the ideal, or else he so conforms himself to the ideal that he ceases to be a human being and acts as a mere automaton without intelligence. So, is not an ideal an actual hindrance to the understanding of the child? If you as a parent really want to understand your child, do you look at him through the screen of an ideal? Or do you simply study him, because you have love in your heart? You observe him, you watch his moods, his idiosyncrasies. Because there is love, you study him. It is only when you have no love that you have an ideal. Watch yourself and you will notice this. When there is no love, you have these enormous examples and ideals, through which you are forcing, compelling the child. But when you have love, you study him, you observe him and give him freedom to be what he is; you guide and help him, not to the ideal, not according to a certain pattern of action, but to bring him to be what he is.

In this question there arises the problem of the so-called bad

boy - if I may use that word to define quickly and strongly a certain point. To change him into not being bad, surely you don't have to have an ideal. If a boy is a liar, you don't have to give him the ideal of truth. You study why he is telling lies. There may be various reasons - probably he is frightened, or is avoiding something. We need not go into the various reasons for lying. But obviously, when a child lies, to make him conform to a pattern of truth, which is your ideal, does not help him to free himself from the causes of lying. You have to study him, you have to observe him, and to do that takes a long time; it demands patience, care, love; and because you have not got it, you force him into a pattern of action which you call an ideal. Obviously, an ideal is a very cheap escape. The school which has ideals, or the teacher who follows ideals is obviously incapable of dealing with a child.

You don't have to accept automatically what I am saying, or deny it. Just observe. After all, the function of education is to turn out an integrated individual who is capable of dealing with life intelligently, wholly - not partially, not as a technician or an idealist. But the individual cannot be integrated if he is merely pursuing an idealistic pattern of action. Obviously, Sirs and Ladies, the teachers who become idealists, who are pursuing a pattern of action, the so-called ideal, are pretty useless. If you observe you will see that they are incapable of love, they have hard hearts and dry minds. Because, it demands much greater observation, greater affection, to study, to observe the child, than to force him into an idealistic pattern of action. And I think that mere examples, which are another form of the ideal, are also a deterrent to intelligence.

Probably what I am saying is contrary to all that you believe.

You will have to think it over, because this is not a matter of denial or acceptance. One has to go into it very, very carefully. I am not being dogmatic; but as there are many questions, I have to be very brief and concise. The implications of an ideal are obvious. When the teacher is pursuing an ideal, he is incapable of understanding the child, because then the future, the ideal, is far more important than the child, the present. He has a certain end in view which he thinks is right, and he is forcing the child to conform to that ideal. Surely, that is not education, is it? That is like turning out motor cars. You have the pattern, and you put the child through the mould, with the result that you create human beings who are mere technicians, who have no human relationship with others, but are out for themselves, for their own gain, politically, socially, or in the family. Obviously, it is much easier to follow an ideal than to observe, to take care, to awaken love for the children and humanity. And that is one of the calamities of modern education: the so-called ideal, the end in view, whether it is an ideology of the extreme left or of the right, has become a pattern of action, and has brought about this present world catastrophe.

Question: Is education in creativeness possible, or is creativeness purely accidental, and therefore nothing can be done to facilitate its emergence?

Krishnamurti: The question is, to put it differently, whether by learning a technique, you will be creative? That is, by practicing, say, the piano, the violin, by learning the technique of painting, will you be a musician, will you be an artist? Does creativeness come into being through technique, or is creativeness independent of technique? You may go to a school and learn all there is to know

about painting, about the depth of colour, the technique of how to hold the brush, and all the rest of it; but will that make you a creative painter? Whereas, if you are creative, then anything that you do will have its own technique. I went once to see a great artist in Paris. He had not learned a technique. He wanted to say something, and he said it in clay and then in marble. Most of us learn the technique, but have very little to say. We neglect, we overlook the capacity to find out for ourselves; we have all the instruments of discovery, without finding anything directly. So, the problem is, how to be creative, which brings its own technique. Then, when you want to write a poem, what happens? You write it; and if you have a technique, so much the better. But if you have no technique, it does not matter - you write the poem, and the delight is in the writing. After all, when you write a love letter, you are not bothered about the technique; you write it with all your being. But when there is no love in your heart, you search out a technique, how to put words together. Sirs, if you do not love, you miss the point. You think you will be able to live happily, creatively, by learning a technique, and it is the technique that is destroying creativeness - which does not mean that you must not have a technique. After all, when you want to write a poem beautifully, you must know the meter, the rhythm, and all the rest of it. But if you want to write it for yourself and not publish it, then it does not matter. You write. It is only when you want to communicate something to another that proper technique is necessary, the right technique, so that there will be no misunderstanding. But surely, to be creative is quite a different problem, and that demands an extraordinary investigation into oneself. It is not a question of gift.

Talent is not creativeness. One can be creative without having a talent. So, what do we mean by creativeness? Surely, a state of being in which conflict has completely ceased, a state of being in which there is no problem, no contradiction. Contradiction, problem, conflict, are the result of too much emphasis put on the 'I', the 'mine' - 'my success', 'my family', 'my country'. When that is absent, then thought itself ceases, and there is a state of being in which creativeness can take place. That is, to put it differently, when the mind ceases to create, there is creation. One of the causes of problems is your belief, your greed, and so on; and the mind creates as long as it has a problem, as long as it is the originator of problems. A mind that is chained to a problem, that is tethered to the creation of its own problem, can never be free. Only when the mind is free from creating its own problems, can there be creation. Sir, to go into it fully and really deeply, one has to go into the whole problem of consciousness; and I say that everyone of us can be creative in the right sense of the word, not merely producing poems and statues, or procreating children. Surely, to be creative means to be in that state in which truth can come into being; and truth can come into being only when there is a complete cessation of the thought process. When the mind is utterly still, without being compelled, forced into a certain pattern of action; when the mind is still because it understands all the problems as they arise and therefore no longer has any problem; when the mind is really quiet, not compelled; then in that state, truth can come into being. That state is creation, and creation is not for the few; it is not the talent of the few or the gift of the few; but that creative state can be discovered by each one who gives his mind and heart to search out

the problem.

Question: Is not the imparting of sex experience a necessary part of education? Is it not the only rational solution to the troubles of adolescence?

Krishnamurti: Sir, to understand sex demands intelligence, not the ideal of something or other; and it is an extremely difficult subject, like every other human problem. If the educator himself has not understood that problem, how can he educate somebody else? If he is himself caught in the net, in the turmoil, in the extraordinarily complex problem of sex, how can he teach another? And why is it a problem to him? Obviously, because he himself is uncreative. Then sex becomes a mere tool of pleasure, an experience which gives momentary joy, momentary absence of self; and therefore it becomes a problem. Whereas, to be free from it, one has to investigate the various hindrances that are preventing creativeness. Obviously, one of the factors is imitation, the social compulsion to be something in society. Following an ideal is obviously a form of compulsion, a form of imitation; therefore, there is no creative thinking. After all, when you are thinking really creatively, when you have strong feeling, sex is of very little importance. It is only when you are not alert to the whole significance of existence, to the movement of the birds, to the trees, to smiles, to the joy of living, whether you are rich or poor - only then sex becomes a problem.

There are other things involved in this question. Can the significance of the sexual experience be imparted to an adolescent child? Naturally, he is curious, he wants to know what it is all about. Again, it depends on the teacher or the parents. Generally,

they are so ashamed of it themselves, they are so shy, the whole thing becomes absurd. They have such dirty minds. Sirs, you should watch yourselves, how you look at people, how you look at men and women. And you think you are capable of telling adolescent children what it is all about!

And there is another problem: Our whole emphasis is laid on sensate values, the values of the senses, in which the radio, the cinema and magazines, play an important part. pick up any magazine or newspaper; all the advertisements are attracting you, creating sensation. So, on the one side, you encourage sensation, sex, sensuality; and on the other, you say, 'You must not, you must become holy, you must follow the ideal of celibacy', It is all nonsense. You create contradiction in the mind, and in that state of contradiction you are incapable of understanding anything. Whereas, if you yourself approach the problem directly, as an obvious biological thing, without all the imputations, all the traditions, all the ugliness behind it, then you can be helpful by your own understanding of it.

As I explained in the previous question, creation is not the mere sexual act, but creation is far more significant, profound; and there can be creation only when the mind is not consumed with its own gratification. Sirs, when one loves, love is chaste; and when there is no love, sex becomes a problem, it becomes an ugly habit. So, our difficulty in all these questions is that we ourselves, the educators, have become so dull, so weary. Life has been too much for us. We want to be comforted, we want to be loved. So, being insufficient, being poor in ourselves, how can we, who are the educators, give right education? Obviously, as I said, the problem

is first the teacher, the educator, and not merely the education of the pupil. Sirs, our own hearts and minds must be cleansed, to be really capable of educating others. You may say that this is very goody stuff, without any practical information; but if the instrument that is teaching is itself crooked, how can it impart right information, right knowledge, right wisdom, right understanding?

Question: Is not State education a calamity? If it is, how to raise funds for schools which are not controlled by the government?

Krishnamurti: Obviously, State education is a calamity - with which governments won't agree. They don't want people to think, they want people to be automatons, because then they can be told what to do. So, our education, especially in the hands of governments, is becoming more and more a means of teaching what to think and not how to think; because, if you were to think independently of the system you would be a danger. Therefore, it is a function of government, not to make you think, but to accept what is told you. So, as you see throughout the world, every government is stepping into education. Education and food have become the means of controlling man. And what do governments care, whether of the left or of the right as long as you are perfect machines to turn out merchandise and bullets? There are a few private schools in England and other places, but they are all being watched carefully, investigated, controlled, because government does not want free institutions which might turn out pacifists, people who think contrary to the regime, to the system. Right education is obviously a danger to government, so it is a function of government to see that is right education is not imparted. There are about 80,000 pacifists in England. If their numbers increase,



are they not a danger to the government? Therefore, control people from childhood. Don't let them think in terms of non-war, non-country, non-systems, or a different ideology. This means government supervision, the control of education through the Educational Minister. Sirs, this is what is happening in the world, whether you like it or not; and it means that you, who are the citizens and who are responsible for government, don't want freedom. You don't want a new state of being, a new culture, a new structure of society. If you have something new it may be revolutionary, it may be destructive of what is; and because you want things as they are, you say, 'Well, let there be a government which will control education'. You want a little modification here and there, but you don't want a revolution in thought; and the moment you want a revolution in thought, government steps in, puts you in prison, or liquidates you quickly behind doors, and you are forgotten. Sirs, a country becomes more and more organized, there is more and more authority and external compulsion, when man himself has no inward vision, inward light, understanding. Then he becomes a mere tool of the authorities, whether in a totalitarian state or in a so-called democracy. Because, in moments of crisis, the so-called democratic states become like the totalitarian, forgetting their democracy and making men conform to a pattern of action.

Now, the second part of the question is, "How to raise funds for schools which are not controlled by the government?". Sir, surely that is not the problem, is it? The moment you have funds, you are ruined. Look at all the schools that start in the most idealistic way. Look at their headmasters. They grow fat on it. But you can start a

little school round the corner of your street. I know several schools that have been started that way, and they are still working, because they were prepared, they have the enthusiasm, the feeling for it. One of our difficulties is that we want to transform the whole of mankind the day after tomorrow - or affect the masses, as you call it. Who are the masses, poor humanity? You and I. And if you feel deeply, if you really think about these problems, not just superficially for an afternoon to while away the time, then you will see that a right school is started somewhere, round the corner or in your own house; because then you are interested in your own children, and in the children about you. Then money will come, Sir, don't bother about money. Money is the least important thing. Leave money to the idealists, who want to start an ideal school. But if you and I are aware of the whole problem of human existence, what it means, why we live, why we suffer, why we go through all these tortures, if we really want to understand it and help the child to understand, then we will start a school without funds, without beating drums and collecting lakhs. Because, the moment you have money, what happens? Don't you know what happens, Sir? You have your own private resources, and you have to watch your money, who is using it, whether you, or your secretary, or the committee, and all the rubbish, the idiotic stuff begins. But if you have little money and real clarity of thought and feeling behind it, then you will create a school. And, in creating the school, obviously you will be opposed by the government, or will have the interference of the government. If you teach your children not to be nationalistic and not to salute the flag because nationalism is a factor which brings about war, if you teach them not to be

communal, if you help them to understand this whole problem of existence, do you think governments are going to stand for it? If you really turn out revolutionaries, not in the sense of killing, but real revolutionaries in thought and feeling, do you think society will put up with it for a minute?

So, Sirs, as parents and teachers, you are responsible, you have to find out whether you are merely complying with the dictates of government, whether you have merely learned a technique which gives you a certain capacity to earn money and are content to carry on the present social structure as it is; or whether you are concerned with right living and right means of livelihood. If you see that governments are built on violence and are the product of violence, and realize that through wrong means a right end cannot possibly be achieved; and if you are interested in really educating your children, obviously you will start a school anywhere - just round the corner, in your backyard, or in your own room. Because, Sirs, I don't think many of us realize to what an abyss, to what degradation, we have come. If there is a third war, that will be the end of things, You may escape; but your problem will be the fourth world war, because we have not solved this problem of man's antagonism to man. and you can solve it only through right means, which is right education - not through an ideal of non-war, but by understanding the causes of war which lie in our attitude toward life, our attitude toward our fellow-beings. Without a change of heart, without goodwill, mere organizations are not going to bring about peace - which is shown by the League of Nations and UNO. To rely on governments, to look to outward organizations for the transformation which must begin with each one of us, is to look in

vain. What we have to do is to transform ourselves, which is to become aware of our own actions, thoughts and feelings in everyday life.

So, don't bother about raising funds. You won't be bothered now, and for a few minutes, while you are pressed into a corner at this meeting, you may see the significance of all this. But afterwards you will slip back into your daily routine, you will go back to your teaching and professions, because you have to earn money. So, there will be very few who are serious. But it is those of you who are serious that will bring about a revolution in thought. Sir, revolution must begin in thought, not in blood; and if there is right revolution in thought, there will be no blood. But if there is no right thinking, no true thinking, there will be blood, more and more of it. The wrong means can never produce the right end, because the end is in the means.

Question: What have you to say about military drill in education?

Krishnamurti: It all depends on what you want the human being to be. If you want him to be efficient cannon fodder, then military drill is marvellous. If you want to discipline him, if you want to regiment his mind, his feelings, then military drill is a very good way to do it. If you want to condition him in a certain way and make him irresponsible to society, then military drill is a very good instrument. It all depends on what you want your son to be. Surely, Sir, if you want him to live, military drill is the wrong way to proceed; but if you like death, then military drill is excellent. And as modern civilization is seeking death, obviously the military with its generals, soldiers, lawyers, and all the rest of it, is considered

very good. In that way you will have death, sure death. But if you want peace, if you want right relationship between man and man - whether he is Christian, Hindu, Mussulman or Buddhist, all these labels being barriers to right relationship - , then military education is an absolute hindrance. Sir. it is surely the function of a general to prepare for war, it is the function of a soldier to maintain war; and if life is meant to be a constant battle between yourself and your neighbour, then by all means have more generals. Then let us all become soldiers - which is what is happening. Conscription was fought in England for generations, while the rest of Europe was being conscripted; and now England has given in. England is part of the whole world structure, and it is an indication of what is happening. In this country, because it is so huge, conscription is not possible immediately; but it will come when you are all thoroughly organized. Then war, more wars, more bloodshed, more misery. Is that what we are living for - constant battle within ourselves and with others? Surely, Sir, to discover truth, reality, the bliss of the unknowable, there must be freedom, freedom from strife within yourself and with your neighbour. After all, when a man is not in strife within himself, then he does not create strife outwardly. The inward strife, projected outwardly, becomes the world chaos. After all, war is a spectacular result of our everyday living; and without a transformation in our daily existence, there is bound to be the multiplication of soldiers, drills, the saluting of flags and all the rubbish that goes with it, inevitably prolonging destruction, misery and chaos. I was told by an anthropologist that two or three thousand years ago a politician said, 'I hope this will be the last war' - and we are still at it. I think we really want arms.

We want all the fun of military instruments, the decorations, the uniforms, the salutes, the drinks, the murder. Because, our everyday life is that. We are destroying others through our greed, through our exploitation. The richer you get, the more exploiting you are. You like all this, and you also want to be rich. As long as the three professions of soldier, police, and lawyer, are dominant in society, civilization is doomed; and that is what is happening in India, as well as the world over. These three professions are becoming stronger and stronger. I don't think you know what is going on about you, and in yourself, what catastrophes you are preparing. All that you want to do is to live a day as rapidly and as stupidly and as disintegratingly as possible, and you leave to the governments, to the politicians, to the cunning people, the direction of your lives.

So, it all depends on what you want life to be. If life is meant to be a series of conflicts, then military expansion is inevitable. If life is meant to be lived happily, with thought, with care, with affection, then the military, the soldier, the police, the lawyer, are a hindrance. But the lawyer, the police, and the military, are not going to give up their professions, any more than you are going to give up your exploiting ways, whether psychologically or outwardly. So, it is very important, Sir, to find out for yourself what is the purpose of living - not to learn it from somebody else, but to discover it for yourself, which means being aware of your daily actions, of your daily feelings and thoughts; and when you are fully aware, that awareness will reveal the true purpose.

Question: What is the place of art in education?

Krishnamurti: I don't quite know what you mean by art. Do you

mean hanging pictures in your school room, or do you mean helping the child to draw a picture according to a pattern, because you have learnt a little technique? Or do you mean teaching the child to be sensitive - not to you as the teacher or to what you say, but sensitive to the miseries, to the confusions, to the sorrows of life? Do you want merely to teach him how to paint, or do you want him to be awake to the influence of beauty - not of any particular picture or statue, but beauty itself? Sir, in modern civilization, beauty is apparently only on the surface of the skin: how you dress, how you paint your face, how you comb your hair, how you walk. We are discussing art, whether beauty is on the surface, or whether it is a matter of love; whether it is outward, or understanding the inward process of thought.

As our society is constructed, we are more concerned with the outward expression, with the looks, with the sari, than with that which is inward. It does not matter what you are within, but you must present a respectable appearance - put on rouge, lip-stick. It does not matter what you are inside. So, we are more concerned with technique than with living, with mere expression than with love. Therefore, we use outward things as a means of covering up our inner ugliness, our inward confusion. We listen to music to escape from our own sorrow. In other words, we become spectators, and not the players. To be creative, you must know yourself, and to know yourself is extremely difficult; but to learn a technique is comparatively easy. So, when you talk about art in education, I don't know exactly what you mean. Obviously, the outward environmental influences have their place; but when the outer is emphasized, the inner confusion is not understood, and so

the inward understanding, the inward beauty, is denied; and without inward beauty, how can there be the outward expression of it? And to cultivate inward beauty, you must first be aware of the inward confusion, the inward ugliness, because beauty does not come into being by itself. To be sensitive to beauty, you must understand the ugly and the confused; and it is only when there is order out of confusion that there is beauty.

Question: Whom would you call a perfect teacher?

Krishnamurti: Obviously, not the teacher who has an ideal, nor he who is making a profit out of teaching, nor he who has built up an organization, nor he who is the instrument of the politician, nor he who is bound to a belief or to a country; but the perfect teacher, surely, is one who does not ask anything for himself, who is not caught up in politics, in power, in position. He does not ask anything for himself, because inwardly he is rich. His wisdom does not lie in books; his wisdom lies in experiencing, and experiencing is not possible if he is seeking an end. Experiencing is not possible to him for whom the result is far more important than the means; to him who wants to show that he has turned out so many pupils who have brilliantly passed exams, who have come out as first class M. A.s, B.A.s, or whatever it is. Obviously, as most of us want a result, we give scant thought to the means employed, and therefore we can never be perfect teachers. Surely, Sir, a teacher who is perfect must be beyond and above the control of society. He must teach and not be told what to teach, which means, he must have no position in society. He must have no authority in society, because the moment he has authority, he is part of society; and since society is always disintegrating, a teacher who is part of society



can never be the perfect teacher. He must be out of it, which means, he cannot ask anything for himself; therefore, society must be so enlightened that it will supply his needs. But we don't want such an enlightened society, nor such teachers. If we had such teachers, then the present society would be in danger. Religion is not organized belief. Religion is the search for truth, which is of no country, which is of no organized belief, which does not lie in any temple, church, or mosque. Without the search for truth, no society can long exist; and while it exists, it is bound to bring about disaster. Surely, the teacher is not merely the giver of information, the teacher is one who points the way to wisdom; and he who points to wisdom is not the guru. Truth is far more important than the teacher. Therefore you, who are the seeker of truth, have to be both the pupil and the teacher. In other words, you have to be the perfect teacher to create a new society; and to bring the perfect teacher into being, you have to understand yourself. Wisdom begins with self-knowledge; and without self-knowledge, mere information leads to destruction. Without self-knowledge, the airplane becomes the most destructive instrument in life; but with self-knowledge, it is a means of human help. So, a teacher must obviously be one who is not within the clutches of society, who does not play power politics or seek position or authority. In himself he has discovered that which is eternal, and therefore he is capable of imparting that knowledge which will help another to discover his own means to enlightenment.

Question: What is the place of discipline in education?

Krishnamurti: I should say, none. Just a minute, I will explain it further. What is the purpose of discipline? What do you mean by

discipline? You, being the teacher, when you discipline, what happens? You are forcing, compelling; there is compulsion, however nice, however kind, which means conformity, imitation, fear. But you will say, 'How can a large school be run without discipline?'. It cannot. Therefore, large schools cease to be educational institutions. They are profitable institutions, for the boss or for the government, for the headmaster or the owner. Sir, if you love your child, do you discipline him? Do you compel him? Do you force him into a pattern of thought? You watch him, don't you? You try to understand him, you try to discover what are the motives, the urges, the drives, that are behind what he does; and by understanding him, you bring about the right environment, the right amount of sleep, the right food, the right amount of play. All that is implied, when you love a child; but we don't love children, because we have no love in our own hearts. We just breed children. And naturally, when you have many, you must discipline them, and discipline becomes an easy way out of the difficulty. After all, discipline means resistance. You create resistance against that which you are disciplining. Do you think resistance will bring about understanding, thought, affection? Discipline can only build walls about you. Discipline is always exclusive, whereas understanding is inclusive. Understanding comes when you investigate, when you enquire, when you search out, which requires care, consideration, thought, affection. In a large school, such things are not possible, but only in a small school. But small schools are not profitable to the private owner or to the government; and since you, who are responsible for the government, are not really interested in your children, what does it

matter? If you loved your children, not just as toys, as playthings to amuse you for a little while and a nuisance afterwards, if you really loved them, would you allow all these things to go on? Wouldn't you want to know what they eat, where they sleep, what they do all day long; whether they are beaten, whether they are crushed, whether they are destroyed? But this would mean an enquiry, consideration for others, whether for your own child or your neighbour's; and you have no consideration, either for your children, or for your wife or husband.

So, the matter lies in your hands, Sirs, not in the hands of any government or system. If all of us really cared for children, we would have a new society tomorrow; but we really do not care, and so we have no time. We have time for puja, we have time for earning money, we have time for clubs, we have time for amusements, but no time to give thought or care to the child. I am not being rhetorical. This is a fact, and you don't want to face the fact. Because, to face the fact means that you would have to give up your amusements and distractions; and do you mean to say you are going to give them up? Certainly not. So, you throw the children into the schools, and the teacher cares no more for them than you do. Why should he? He is there for his job, for his money, and so it goes on; and we come together for an evening to discuss education! It is really a marvellous world we have got. It is such a phoney superficial world, so ugly if you look behind the curtain; and we are decorating the curtain and hoping that everything will be right behind it. Sirs, I don't think you, the educators and the parents, realize how serious things are. The catastrophe that is going on in this country is obvious; but you don't want to strip it all

bare and begin again, anew. You want to do patch-work reforms, and that is why all these questions arise. Sirs, you have to start anew, there can be no patch-work reform; because, the building is crumbling, the walls are giving way, there is a fire destroying it. You must leave the building and start anew in a different place, with different values, with different foundations. But those who are making a profit out of education, whether the State or the individual, will go on, because they do not see the destruction, the deterioration, the degradation. But those who really see the whole catastrophe, not just in a few spots, but the world over, have to strip themselves of everything and start anew. I don't mean stripping off the outward knowledge, the technical knowledge. I know it can never be stripped off; but you can strip yourselves inwardly, see yourselves as you are, your ugliness, your brutality, your ruthlessness, your deceptions, your dishonesty, your utter lack of love. Seeing all that, you can start anew, and become honest, clear, simple, direct. Surely, only then is there a possibility of a new world and a new order. Peace does not come through patch-work reform. Peace does not come through mere adjustment of things as they are. Peace comes only when we understand what is, beyond the superficial. Peace can come into being only when the wave of destruction, which is the wave of our own action, is stopped. Sirs, how can we have love? Not through the pursuit of the ideal of love, but only when there is no hatred, when there is no greed, when there is consideration, when there is generosity; but a man who is occupied with exploitation, with greed, with envy, can never know love. When there is love, systems become of very little importance. When there is love, there is care, there is

consideration, not only for the children, but for every human being.

March 13, 1948

## **BOMBAY 10TH PUBLIC TALK 14TH MARCH, 1948**

I would like this afternoon to discuss the problem of action, which might be rather abstruse and difficult at the beginning, but I hope by thinking it over, we will be able to see the issue clearly.

Because, our whole existence, our whole life, is a process of action. It is an action at different levels of consciousness. Please, I am afraid you will have to pay a little attention to this, because it is going to be extremely difficult if you do not follow it very closely, if your attention is distracted by those who are passing behind me. I shall not be distracted; but you will be, unfortunately, and therefore you will not be able to follow it and will miss its beauty; because, it is quite a difficult problem and needs very close attention.

Most of us live in a series of actions, of seemingly unrelated, disjointed actions, leading to disintegration, to frustration. It is a problem that concerns each one of us, because we live by action; and without action, there is no life, there is no experience, there is no thinking. Thought is action; and merely to pursue action at one particular level of consciousness, which is the outer, merely to be caught up in outward action without understanding the whole process of action itself, will inevitably lead us to frustration, to misery. Therefore, if I may suggest, and though the problem is quite simple, one has to be a little concentrated - not with the concentration of exclusiveness, but with the interest which brings, not exclusion, but attention. That is what is needed: to be attentive with interest. Then you and I will go together; then I won't take the

journey alone, and you won't become a mere spectator. And if we can take the journey together, it will be much more creative, much more interesting, more vital and significant, and therefore you will be able to follow it for yourself in daily action.

So, our life is a series of actions, or a process of action at different levels of consciousness. Now, consciousness, as I explained the other day, is experiencing, naming, and recording. That is, consciousness is challenge and response, which is experiencing, then terming or naming, and then recording, which is memory. This process is action, is it not? Consciousness is action; and without challenge, response, without experiencing, naming or terming, and recording, which is memory, there is no action. Whether you are a big executive, a big business man, raking in money and piling up a bank account, or a writer, or just an ordinary man earning an ordinary livelihood, this is the process that is going on: experiencing, naming or terming, and recording; and this whole process is consciousness, which is action.

Now, action creates the actor. That is, the actor comes into being when action has a result, an end in view, If there is no result in action, then the actor is not; but if there is an end or a result in view, then action brings about the actor. So, actor, action, and end or result, is a unitary process, a single process, which comes into being when action has an end in view. Action towards a result, is will. otherwise, there is no will, is there? The desire to achieve an end brings about will, which is the actor - I want to achieve, I want to write a book, I want to be a rich man, I want to paint a picture. Will is action with an end in view, a result to be gained, which brings about the actor, So, the actor or will, the action, and the end

or result, is one process. Though we can break it up and observe these factors separately, it is a total, unitary process.

Now, we are familiar with these three states: the actor, the action, and the end. That is our daily existence. I am just explaining what is; but we will begin to understand how to transform what is, only when we examine it clearly, so that there is no illusion, prejudice, no bias with regard to it. Now, these three states, which constitute experience - the actor, the action, and the result - , these three states, surely, are a process of becoming.

Otherwise, there is no becoming, is there? If there is no actor, and if there is no action toward an end, there is no becoming; but life as we know it, our daily life, is a process of becoming. I am poor, and I act with an end in view, which is to become rich. I am ugly, and I want to become beautiful. Therefore, my life is a process of becoming something. The will to be is the will to become, at different levels of consciousness, in different states, in which there is challenge, response, naming, and recording. Now, this becoming is strife, this becoming is pain, is it not? It is a constant struggle: I am this, and I want to become that. The becoming is a constant battle - the rich man competing with the richer to maintain his position, the poor man trying to become rich, the artist trying to achieve a result, write a book or a poem, paint a picture. There is always an end in view, a result to be achieved, and in that process of becoming there is a ceaseless battle, a strife, a pain. With that we are familiar - I have not described anything other than what is.

So, then, the problem is: Is there not action without this becoming? That is, is there not action without this pain, without this constant battle? If there is no end, there is no actor, because



action with an end in view creates the actor. But can there be action without an end in view, and therefore no actor? Because, the moment there is action with the desire for a result, there is the actor, and therefore the actor is always becoming; therefore the actor is the source of strife, pain, misery. And, to eliminate that strife, can there be action without the actor, that is, without the desire for a result? Only such action is not a becoming, and therefore not a strife. There is a state of action, a state of experiencing without the experiencer and the experience. This sounds rather philosophical, but it is really quite simple. We know that in our daily actions, in our everyday life, there is always the actor or experiencer, the process of experiencing, and the experience; the actor is acting in order to achieve an end, and I know that that process always produces strife, because I live in strife with my wife, with my husband, with my neighbours, with my boss. I know the life of strife and conflict, and I want to eliminate conflict, because I recognize that conflict does not lead anywhere. It is only creative happiness that brings about a revolutionary state. So, to find action without strife, there must be no actor; and there is no actor only when there is no end in view. Can I live in a state of experiencing all the time, without the desire for a result? That is the only way to solve this problem, is it not? As long as action has an end in view, there must be the actor, the experiencer, the observer, and therefore a process of becoming which creates strife, and therefore a state of contradiction. Can one live in action without a state of contradiction? There can be freedom from contradiction only when there is no actor and no end to be achieved, which means a state of constant experiencing

without the object of experience, and therefore without the experiencer. Now, we live in that state when the experiencing in itself is intense. Take, for example, any intense experience that you have. In the moment of experiencing, you are not aware of yourself as the experiencer apart from the experience; you are in a state of experiencing. Take a very simple example: you are angry. In that moment of anger, there is neither the experiencer nor the experience; there is only experiencing. But the moment you come out of it, a split second after the experiencing, there is the experiencer and the experience, the actor and the action with an end in view - which is to get rid of or to suppress the anger. So, we are in this state repeatedly, in the state of experiencing; but we always come out of it and give it a term, naming and recording it, and thereby giving continuity to becoming.

Now, the problem is, how can there be freedom from conflict in action? As I said, only when experiencing is lived completely, wholly, all the time. You can live completely, wholly, only when there is no terming, when there is no naming, and therefore no recording, which is memory. Memory is the recorder of the outcome of action with an end in view. Sir, when you have an experience and you are in that moment of experiencing, if you don't term it, if you don't give it a name and therefore record it, put it in the frame of reference which is memory, then that experiencing is joy, that experiencing is creation.

Experiment with what I have said. It is very simple. We know the first process, which is action seeking an end, a result, and bringing into being the actor. The actor, or action with an end in view, is the process of becoming, and this process is constant strife,

constant pain. With that we are familiar. To be in strife is essentially a state of contradiction, and in a state of contradiction there can never be the capacity to live fully, because there must always be a struggle, there must always be pain, To be free of pain, there can be only one state, that of experiencing - which is action without the actor, and without a result, an end in view. It is not as crazy as it sounds. If you observe very closely, you will see that, in moments of great ecstasy, you do live in that state of experiencing, without the actor or experiencer, and the object of experience. Most of us have known that state of experiencing; and having known it, we want to continue it, and thereby we give birth again to becoming. That is, we want a result, which is action with an end in view; and therefore we strengthen the framework of reference, which is memory. So, to bring about a state of constant experiencing, which is really extraordinarily revolutionary, we must be aware of this process of action which is always seeking an end, a result, and therefore giving birth to the actor. We must be fully aware of that process; and when we are aware of that and see the truth, the significance, the pain of it, then in that passive awareness we will know the state of experiencing in which there is neither the experiencer nor the experience.

I have about eight questions, and it has been suggested that I answer them briefly, not at length; because, when I answer a question at length, it becomes a lecture, and many of us cannot keep a sustained thought for a long period of time. If I answer each question briefly, perhaps you will be able to grasp it better. So, I am going to try this evening to answer as many of these questions as possible, and see what the result is.

Question: What is the relation between the thinker and his thought?

Krishnamurti: Now, is there any such relation, or is there only one thing, which is thought, and not the thinker? Because, if there are no thoughts, there is no thinker. When you are thinking, when you have thoughts, is there a thinker? If you have no thoughts at all, where is the thinker? Now, having thoughts, seeing the impermanency of thoughts, the thinker comes into being. That is, thought creates the thinker; and because thoughts are transient, the thinker becomes the permanent entity. There is first the process of thought, and then thought creates the thinker, obviously. The thinker then establishes himself as a permanent entity, apart from thoughts. That is, thoughts are transient, they are always in a state of flux, and thought objects to its own impermanency; therefore, thought creates the thinker. It is not the other way round, the thinker does not create thought, If you have no thoughts, there is no thinker; so it is thought that creates the thinker. Then we try to establish a relationship between the thinker, and the thought which has created him. That is, we try to establish a relationship between that which seeks to be permanent, which is the thinker created by thought, and the thought itself, which is transient. But obviously both are transient, Since thought, which is transient, creates the thinker, and though the thinker may imagine himself to be permanent, he also is transient; because the thinker is the outcome of thought.

This is not a conundrum. It is an obvious fact. Pursue a thought completely, go through with it to the end, think it out fully, and you will see what happens. You will find that there is no thinker at all,

because it is the thought which creates the thinker. Therefore, there are not two states as the thinker and the thought. The thinker is a fictitious entity, an unreal state. There is only thought; and the bundle of thoughts creates the 'I', the thinker. And the thinker, having given himself permanency, tries to transform thought and thereby maintain himself, which is false; and if you can think out every thought fully, completely, that is, let each thought go right through to the end without resistance, then you will see there is no thinker at all. Therefore, the mind becomes extraordinarily pliable, quiet. And that quiet, that tranquillity, is the state of experiencing. As there is neither the actor nor the end in view, neither the experiencer nor the experience, it is a state of experiencing, which is pure action. Try this and you will see that thought is constantly giving birth to further thought, and therefore maintaining the thinker. But when there is no thinker - which there is not, only a thought process - , that is, when the thought process is completely understood, in that passive awareness when every thought is allowed full scope, full depth, then there is freedom from all thought; and in that freedom, there is experiencing.

Question: I would like to help you by doing propaganda for your teachings. Can you advise the best way?

Krishnamurti: To be a propagandist is to be a liar. (Laughter.) Don't laugh, Sirs. Because, propaganda is merely repetition, and repetition of a truth is a lie. When you repeat what you consider to be the truth, then it ceases to be the truth. Say, for instance, you repeat the truth concerning man's relationship to property, the truth which you have not discovered for yourself; what value has it? Repetition has no value; it merely dulls the mind, and you can only

repeat a lie. You cannot repeat truth, because truth is never constant. Truth is a state of experiencing, and what you can repeat is a static state; therefore it is not the truth. Please do see the importance of this. We are so used to being propagandists, to reading newspapers, to telling others about everything. The propagandist is a mere repeater, not a teller of truth; therefore, propaganda does infinite damage in the world. The lecturer who goes out doing propaganda for an idea is really a destroyer of thought, because he just repeats his own or somebody else's experience. But truth cannot be repeated, truth must be experienced from moment to moment by each one. Now, with that understanding, what can you do to help this teaching, to further this teaching? All that you can do is to live it; however little you understand, however tiny a part, live it completely - not superficially, but deeply, fully, as vitally, as intrinsically, as enthusiastically as possible. Then, like a flower in a garden, that very living spreads its perfume. You don't have to do propaganda for the jasmine. The jasmine itself does the propaganda; its beauty, its perfume, its loveliness, tells the story. When you have not that loveliness, that beauty, you do propaganda for it, but the moment you have understood a little, you talk about it, preach it, shout it; because of your own understanding, you help another to understand, and therefore understanding spreads more and more, it moves further and further afield. Surely, that is the only way to do what you call 'propaganda' - which is an ugly word. Sir, how does a new thought spread, a living thought, not a dead thought? Surely, not through propaganda. Systems spread through propaganda, but not a living thought. A living thought is spread by a living person,

one who lives that thought. Without living it, you cannot spread a living thought; but the moment you live it, you will see. It is like the bees coming to the flower. The flower need not do propaganda for its honey - the bees know it, they come because there is nectar. But without that nectar, to do propaganda is to deceive people, to exploit people, to cause division among people, to create envy and antagonism. But if there is that nectar of understanding, however little, then it spreads like fire. You know how honey is secured, how many journeys a bee makes from the beehive to the flower, how it collects honey a little at a time. Similarly, if there is nectar, if there is beauty, if there is understanding in our hearts, that itself will perform the miracle of completely revolutionizing the world. Understanding is instantaneous, not tomorrow, because there is no understanding tomorrow; there is understanding only today, now. Love is not in the future; you don't say, 'I shall love you tomorrow'. You either love now, or never.

Question: The fact of death stares everybody in the face, yet its mystery is never solved. Must it ever be so?

Krishnamurti: Sir, this is an enormous problem, and we have to deal with it in a few minutes. Now, why is there fear of death? There is fear of death because we cling to continuity. I am writing a book, and I might die tomorrow without finishing it; I am accumulating money, and I might die without achieving what I want; I long to be something which I am not. So, there is fear of death. There is fear of death as long as there is a desire for continuity - continuity of action, continuity of character, continuity of achievement, continuity of faculty, continuity of a bank account, of a name, of a family. As long as there is the actor, which is action

seeking a result, there must be continuity, and therefore fear that there will be no continuity; because, death may put an end to my writing a book, to my bank account, to the qualities, the various characteristics, which I have cultivated. All that is going to come to an end, therefore there is fear. So, there is fear of death as long as there is continuity.

Now, what happens when there is this sense of continuity? We are not discussing whether there is continuity or not, but what the idea of continuity does to the mind. Have you ever noticed what happens to a thing that continues? Surely, that which continues is in a state of constant disintegration, is it not? If you have a problem that continues over a period of years, causing you constant worry, there is disintegration, is there not? Any form of continuity, however noble or ignoble, is a process of disintegration. If we see the truth of that - that any form of continuity is a process of disintegration - , then we see the truth about the false. Therefore, there is liberation from the false, which means that one is living constantly in the present, not in continuity; therefore, there is no longer the fear of death. It is only when the mind is caught in the net of continuity that there is the fear of death; and when the mind recognizes that anything that continues can never renew itself, then there is freedom from the fear of death. How can there be renewal when there is continuity? There can be renewal only when there is an ending, which means when there is death. I don't know if you have noticed that when you have brought an end to a problem, there is a renewal; but while the problem continues, there is decay. Is it not possible to live every day, every minute, seeing each thought through to the end, so that it is not continued? That means,



is it not possible to live with death, dying from moment to moment? Then only is there renewal; because, only in ending is there renewal, not in continuity. Renewal and continuity are contradictions. In continuity there is no rebirth, no renewal, no creativeness, but only in ending. When one problem ends, a new problem may arise; but in the interval between two problems, there is renewal. Therefore, there is no fear of death.

To put it differently, death is the state of non-continuity, which is the state of rebirth. Death is the unknown because it is an ending, in which there is renewal. But a mind which is continuous cannot know the unknown; it can only know the known, because it can only act and move in the known, which is the continuous.

Therefore, the known, the continuous, is always in fear of the unknown, of death, in which alone there is renewal. In ending there is renewal, not in continuity. So, the unknown can never be known through the continuous. Therefore, death remains a mystery, because we are approaching it all the time through the known, through the continuous. If you can end this continuity from day to day, from moment to moment, you will see there is a renewal; there is death, in which there is renewal. Death, then, is not a thing to be feared; for in ending there is rebirth, and in continuity there is decay, there is disintegration. Think it out, Sirs, and you will see the beauty of it, the truth of it. It is not a theory, but a fact. That which has an ending, has a rebirth; that which is continuous can never know renewal. Death is the unknown, and that which is continuous is the known. The continuous can never know the unknown, and therefore it is afraid, mystified by the unknown. Immortality is not the `I' continued. The `I' is of time, it is the

result of time. That which is immortal is beyond time. Therefore, there is no relationship between the 'I', and the timeless. We like to think so, but that is another deception of the mind. That which is immortal cannot be encased in the mortal, it cannot be caught in the net of time. Only when the 'I', which is continuity, time, comes to an end, is there that state which is imperishable, immortal. After all, we are frightened of death from force of habit, because desire seeks continuity in fulfilment. But fulfilment has no end, because fulfilment is constantly seeking other forms of fulfilment. Desire is constantly seeking further objects of fulfilment, and therefore gives birth to continuity, which is time. But if each desire is understood as it arises, and so comes to an end, then there is a renewal. It may be the renewal of a new desire - it doesn't matter. Go on finishing, give each desire an ending, and you will see that out of this ending from moment to moment there comes a renewal which is not the renewal of desire, but the renewal of truth. And truth is not continuous; truth is a state of being which is timeless. That state can be experienced only when each desire, which gives birth to continuity, is understood and thereby brought to an end. The known cannot know the unknown. The mind, which is the result of the known, of the past, which is founded upon the past, cannot know the immeasurable, the timeless. The mind, the thought process, must come to an end; then that which is the unknowable, the immeasurable, the eternal, comes into being.

Question: I have plenty of money. Can you tell me what is the right use of money? Only don't ask me to squander it by distributing coppers to the poor. Money is a tool to work with, not just a nuisance to be got rid of.

Krishnamurti: Sir, first, how do you have money? How do you accumulate money? Obviously, through exploitation, through cruelty, through barbarity. In the modern world, in which man is out for himself, obviously he must be clever, cunning, dishonest, ruthless, to accumulate money. Don't let us fool ourselves with all this; to be rich implies cruelty. Sir, don't you know that the rich man cannot enter the kingdom of heaven? It is as difficult for him as for the camel to pass through the eye of a needle. When you have accumulated money, what happens? You want to know how to use it; either you become a philanthropist, or you want to use it rightly. That is, you accumulate money wrongly, and then try to use it rightly. (Laughter.) Sirs, this is not a laughable matter. This is what we are doing. Don't laugh at the rich. You want to be rich too. You accumulate, and then want to know how to use money rightly. How can it be done, Sir?

But suppose I have been left money - thank God, I haven't - , suppose I have been left some money. What shall I do with it? What am I to do after getting money, how shall I use it? That is the problem. Shall I give it all away to the poor and become poor also, and be dependent on somebody else? Shall I keep a little, and give the rest away? Shall I use it as a right means to a right end? Shall I become a trustee of it? So, my problem is, having acquired or been left with that thing which is called money, what shall I do with it? Sir, it all depends on your heart, not on your mind; and a mind that has accumulated money is not a generous mind. It is a hard mind, and such a mind cannot deal with that which is material, except on its own level. Therefore, only a heart that knows love can solve this problem, not the mind, not a system. If you have love in your heart,

you will know what to do with money - whether to give it all away, because you see it is a nuisance, or to act otherwise, according to the dictates of your heart. But to know the prompting of an affectionate heart is very difficult, especially for those who are rich, because you have never thought in those terms of action. You have always been accustomed to ruthlessness, to hardness; and to look at the problem with affectionate consideration is very difficult. So, more important than money, is love; and when you have money without love, then woe to you. Having money, and realizing that your heart is empty, the problem then is not money, but to awaken the spring, the perfume, the beauty of the heart; and when that is awakened, you will know how to act. Without love, merely to become a philanthropist is another form of exploitation. When there is love, then love will show the way to the rich man and also to the poor man. Because, Sir, love is the solvent; love is the only way out of this contradiction of being rich and knowing what to do with the riches. Without love, mere consideration of what to do with wealth becomes another form of escape from our own misery, our own strife, our own emptiness.

Question: I am a writer, and am faced with periods of sterility when nothing seems to come. These periods begin and end without any apparent reason. What is the cause and cure?

Krishnamurti: That is, Sir, to put the problem differently, there are moments of creativeness, and moments of dullness; moments of sensitivity, and moments of insensitivity. Now, why is there this gap? Why is there not one constant stretch of creativeness? Why is there not constant sensitivity? Obviously, the problem is not how to be creative all the time, but why there is insensitivity. The

creative state comes into being, it cannot be invited, it cannot be held by concentration, it cannot be maintained. What we can deal with is insensitivity, those moments of dullness, those moments of uncreativity. Now, why do they come into being? Why is there no creativity, why is there insensitivity? Obviously, because we are doing things, thinking things, feeling things, which are in themselves insensitive. How can there be greed, ruthlessness, crudeness, and yet be sensitivity? I write a book. It becomes popular, it is accepted by one of the Hollywood studios, and I have plenty of money. I have lost sensitivity because I am after money, position; or I want to be elected to Parliament as a member of some party. So, obviously, greed brings about insensitivity; and without tackling the causes of insensitivity, we cling to creativity, we long for creativity, which is another escape from what is. From the moment I understand and tackle what is, there comes creative being; when I understand what are the many causes that bring about insensitivity and dullness, and liberate thought from those, then there is a creative state.

So, the problem is, first of all, to recognize, to be aware of insensitivity, and of its cause - not to probe into it, but to be passively aware of your insensitivity. That is, Sir, be passively aware of it, recognize it, live with it without contradiction, without denial, without condemnation. In that state of passive awareness, you will see that the cause of dullness is revealed; and when the cause is revealed, there is immediately the state of sensitivity. You can experiment with it and you will see. There is the state of dullness, and you are aware of it. The moment you are passively aware of it, there is a pause, there is a period in which there is no

contradiction, no condemnation. Then, in that period, if you don't condemn, the unconscious which holds the cause, is shown; and by being passively aware, the cause and the effect are destroyed.

Therefore, there is a state of sensitivity. You don't have to accept my word for it. You can experiment with it, and you will see this actually takes place. If there is passive awareness in which the dullness is perceived, and immediately after the perception there is a period of silence without condemnation, then in that period of observation without condemnation, the cause of insensitivity, of dullness, is revealed. The truth of that perception frees the mind from insensitivity. Therefore, there is a state of creativeness. But, unfortunately, the writer, the painter, the sculptor, has to live. He is not merely satisfied with the beauty of the marble, with the expression of beauty, with the garland of words. He wants a result, he wants cash, he wants food, clothing and shelter. If he merely wanted clothing, food and shelter, then it would be comparatively simple. But he uses food, clothing and shelter as a psychological means to expand himself; his art, his writing, becomes a means of self-expansion, and thereby brings about strife, misery, that dullness which prevents creative being. But if I write a book, though it may be a means of livelihood, if I do not use it as a psychological process of self-expansion, then there can never be a moment of dullness. Then there is a constant renewal, because I am not asking anything; then the `I' is absent. Where there is the absence of the `I', there is no continuity, therefore there is constant ending; therefore there is renewal, there is eternal creation.

Question: Is not the direct effect of your person helpful in understanding your teachings? Do we not grasp better the teaching

when we love the teacher?

Krishnamurti: No Sir. You understand better when you love people, when you love your neighbour, not the teacher. When you love your wife, your child, your neighbour, white or brown - for there is no class distinction in love - , when there is a perfume, a song in your heart, then it brings an understanding. Obviously, when you are listening to me, my explaining does help; because I am making myself very clear, and you are listening attentively. You are being forced to listen for a couple of hours, whether you like it or not. You are giving your mind and heart to find out; you would not come here if you didn't want to find out. Therefore, it is mutual. You are seeking, and I am helping. But if you were not seeking, you would not be here, you would not listen to me. Surely, Sir, when a person understands something clearly, and you talk to that person, your own mind becomes clear. But if you make of that person your guru and love him, if you merely love the teacher, then you will have contempt for your servant. Have you not noticed, Sirs, how very respectful you are to me, and how very cruel you are to your servant, to your wife, to your neighbours? Is that not a state of contradiction? I really don't care whether you are respectful or insolent to me; it doesn't matter much. But it matters an awful lot how you treat your wife, your servant. When you respect one and deny that respect to everybody else, then you are in a state of hypocrisy, and such respect, offered to one and denied to others, can never lead you to truth. What brings understanding is respect for man, the love of man. When your own heart is full, then you look for truth everywhere, then you listen to the song of the birds, to the raindrops, you see the smiles, the sorrows of man. In every

leaf, in a dead leaf, there is that which is eternal; but we do not know how to look for it because our minds are so full of other things besides this search.

So, mere respect for one is of very little significance when you have no respect for everyone - respect being affection, kindness, consideration; but when there is love, consideration, generosity, causing no enmity, then you are already very near. Then you are in a state of sensitivity, and that which is sensitive is capable of receiving. You cannot go to truth, you cannot go to the unknown; truth, the unknown, must come to you. But it cannot come to you if your mind is burdened, heavy, forced, ruthless, hard. So, in listening to me, if you are merely being stimulated through hearing, then it will have no significance, because all stimulation is sensual. It can have significance only in your daily action, in your relationships with people, with ideas, and with things. Then you will find out, Sir, whether any of these things have meaning - not by listening to me for a couple of hours. What matters is how you are with your servant, with your wife, with your husband, with your neighbour; because, the moment there is thought, an awakened, intelligent enquiry, then there is devotion; for the very search for truth is devotion. And where there is devotion, where there is love, there is understanding.

March 14, 1948



## **BOMBAY 11TH PUBLIC TALK 21ST MARCH, 1948**

I think I will answer questions mostly this evening, but before I do so I would like to make one or two remarks. Next Sunday will be the last talk, and there will be no talks thereafter. The discussions will end on the 28th.

There is a tendency, I think, especially among those who have read a great deal and have experienced according to their reading, to translate what I say in terms of their old knowledge. It is like putting new wine in old bottles. When one puts new wine in old bottles, the new wine ferments and breaks the bottle. That is generally what happens. Similarly, perhaps, those who have read along a particular line are apt to translate what I say according to their previous knowledge, and I think it is a mistake merely to translate or put into the old language what one hears. Because, merely to translate what you hear into old terminologies does not bring about understanding. It makes one classify, pigeonhole what one hears, which really prevents understanding. What brings understanding is direct comprehension - not comprehension through the old language, the old terminology, the old words, with their specific meanings. So, if I may suggest, it will be beneficial and worthwhile to listen and comprehend directly, without translating what is said into your particular terminology of usage of words. Most of us have accumulated knowledge, and according to that knowledge, we act. But self-knowledge is different; self-knowledge is not accumulative, residual knowledge, but it demands constant alertness, watchfulness. The moment we

accumulate knowledge, it becomes a burden; and where there is a burden, a weight, travelling becomes impossible or very difficult. Whereas, self-knowledge, the knowledge of the whole total process of oneself, does not demand any previous knowledge at all. On the contrary, where there is previous knowledge, there is bound to be misunderstanding, misinterpretation, and mistranslation. It is like taking a journey: as you proceed, you begin to understand the country, the scenery. Or, you dig a well, and drink the waters of that well. Similarly, self-knowledge is not accumulative, it is a constant movement, it is knowledge from moment to moment, always living, always a discovery, always creative. It is only when there is accumulation, when there are residual remains which become memory, that knowledge is an impediment to creative living, creative being. After all, the knowledge that we have is technical, is it not? We do not accumulate knowledge about ourselves. If we do, it is the memory of what other people have said, or what we have learnt in books, or it is a repetition of words, merely the hearsay of another. Very few of us have self-knowledge, the knowledge of what one actually is. Most of us live superficially. It may be likened to an iceberg: only one tenth of it shows on the surface, the rest is below the water. Similarly, we live one-tenth on the surface, and we are very agitated; our activities, our social, political, religious existence, is all on the surface. We never go below and enquire into the depths, where most of our existence really is. But to enquire deeply, profoundly, there must be this constant discovery. First, obviously, there must be the knowledge of our superficial daily actions, daily thoughts, daily feelings. When those are understood, then one can penetrate deeper

and deeper into that total process which is the `I', the `you'. And that discovery does not demand previous knowledge; on the contrary, previous knowledge becomes a hindrance. The more you dig, the more you understand, and the art of understanding does not lie in accumulation, in memory. Surely, understanding comes from moment to moment, when the mind is fresh, pliable, alert, passive. In that state, understanding comes silently and swiftly - or slowly, depending on the pliability, the sensitivity, the quickness of the mind.

So, self-knowledge is not knowledge which is accumulated. Where there is accumulation, there cannot be discovery and therefore right thinking, true thinking, which is from moment to moment. True action is from moment to moment, not disciplined according to a pattern, an example, or according to an ideal with an end or a result in view. If you will experiment with this, you will discover that self-knowledge is a constant renewal, not an end to be gained or achieved. It is a constant movement in the journey of self-discovery. The deeper, the more swiftly, the mind is able to penetrate, the more it is capable of discovery, and the more there is bliss, there is joy, in that discovery.

I have several questions, and I will answer as many of them as possible.

Question: What is it that comes when nationalism goes?

Krishnamurti: Obviously, intelligence. But I am afraid that is not the implication in this question. The implication is, what can be substituted for nationalism? Any substitution is an act which does not bring intelligence. If I leave one religion and join another, or leave one political party and later on join something else, this

constant substitution indicates a state in which there is no intelligence,

Now, how does nationalism go? Only by understanding its full implications, by examining it, by being aware of its significance in outward and inward action. Outwardly it brings about divisions between people, classifications, wars and destruction, which is obvious to anyone who is observant. Inwardly, psychologically, this identification with the greater, with the country, with an idea, is obviously a form of self-expansion. That is, living in a little village, or a big town, or whatever it be, I am nobody; but if I identify myself with the larger, with the country, if I call myself a Hindu, it flatters my vanity, it gives me gratification, prestige, a sense of well being; and that identification with the larger, which is a psychological necessity for those who feel that self-expansion is essential, also creates conflict, strife, between people. So, nationalism not only creates outward conflict, but inward frustrations; and when one understands nationalism, the whole process of nationalism, it falls away. The understanding of nationalism comes through intelligence. That is, by carefully observing, by probing into the whole process of nationalism, patriotism, out of that examination comes intelligence, and then there is no substitution of something else for nationalism. The moment you substitute religion for nationalism, religion becomes another means of self expansion, another source of psychological anxiety, a means of feeding oneself through a belief. Therefore, any form of substitution, however noble, is a form of ignorance. It is like a man substituting chewing gum, or betel nut, or whatever it is, for smoking. Whereas, if one really understands the whole

problem of smoking, of habits, sensations, psychological demands, and all the rest of it, then smoking drops away. You can understand only when there is a development of intelligence, when intelligence is functioning; and intelligence is not functioning when there is substitution. Substitution is merely a form of self-bribery, to tempt you not to do this but to do that. Nationalism, with its poison, with its misery and world strife, can disappear only when there is intelligence, and intelligence does not come merely by passing examinations and studying books. Intelligence comes into being when we understand problems as they arise. When there is understanding of the problem at its different levels, not only of the outward part, but of its inward, psychological implications, then, in that process, intelligence comes into being. So, when there is intelligence, there is no substitution; and when there is intelligence, then nationalism, patriotism, which is a form of stupidity, disappears.

Question: What is the difference between awareness and introspection? And who is aware in awareness?

Krishnamurti: Let us first examine what we mean by introspection. We mean by introspection, looking within oneself, examining oneself. Now, why does one examine oneself? In order to improve, in order to change, in order to modify. That is, you introspect in order to become something, otherwise you would not indulge in introspection. You would not examine yourself if there were not the desire to modify, change, to become something other than what you are. Surely, that is the obvious reason for introspection. I am angry, and I introspect, examine myself, in order to get rid of anger, or to modify or change anger. Now, where

there is introspection, which is the desire to modify or change the responses, the reactions of the self, there is always an end in view; and when that end is not achieved, there is moodiness, depression. So, introspection invariably goes with depression. I don't know if you have noticed that when you introspect, when you look into yourself in order to change yourself, there is always a wave of depression. There is always a moody wave which you have to battle against; you have to examine yourself again in order to overcome that mood, and so on. Introspection is a process in which there is no release, because it is a process of transforming what is into something which it is not. Obviously, that is exactly what is taking place when we introspect, when we indulge in that peculiar action. In that action, there is always an accumulative process, the 'I' examining something in order to change it. So, there is always a dualistic conflict, and therefore a process of frustration. There is never a release; and realizing that frustration, there is depression.

Now, awareness is entirely different. Awareness is observation without condemnation. Awareness brings understanding, because there is no condemnation or identification, but silent observation. Surely, if I want to understand something, I must observe, I must not criticize, I must not condemn, I must not pursue it as pleasure or avoid it as non-pleasure. There must merely be the silent observation of a fact. There is no end in view, but awareness of everything as it arises. That observation and the understanding of that observation cease when there is condemnation, identification, or justification. Introspection is self-improvement, and therefore introspection is self-centredness. Awareness is not self-improvement. On the contrary, it is the ending of the self, of the 'I',

with all its peculiar idiosyncrasies, memories, demands and pursuits. In introspection, there is identification and condemnation. In awareness, there is no condemnation or identification; therefore, there is no self-improvement. There is a vast difference between the two. The man who wants to improve himself can never be aware, because improvement implies condemnation and the achievement of a result. Whereas, in awareness, there is observation without condemnation, without denial or acceptance. That awareness begins with outward things, being aware, being in contact with objects, with nature. First, there is awareness of things about one, being sensitive to objects, to nature, then to people, which means relationship, and then there is awareness of ideas. This awareness, being sensitive to things, to nature, to people, to ideas, is not made up of separate processes, but is one unitary process. It is a constant observation of everything, of every thought and feeling and action as they arise within oneself. And as awareness is not condemnatory, there is no accumulation. You condemn only when you have a standard, which means there is accumulation, and therefore improvement of the self. Awareness is to understand the activities of the self, the 'I', in its relationship with people, with ideas, and with things. That awareness is from moment to moment, and therefore it cannot be practiced. When you practise a thing, it becomes a habit; and awareness is not habit. A mind that is habitual is insensitive, a mind that is functioning within the groove of a particular action is dull, unplayable; whereas, awareness demands constant pliability, alertness. This is not difficult. It is what you all do when you are interested in something, when you are interested in watching your child, your

wife, your plants, trees, birds. You observe without condemnation, without identification; therefore, in that observation, there is complete communion, the observer and the observed are completely in communion. This actually takes place when you are deeply, profoundly interested in something. So, there is a vast difference between awareness, and the self-expansive improvement of introspection. The one, which is introspection, leads to frustration, to further and greater conflict; whereas, awareness is a process of release from the action of the self; it is to be aware of your daily movements, of your thoughts, of your actions, and to be aware of another, to observe him. You can do that only when you love somebody, when you are deeply interested in something; and when I want to know myself, my whole being, the whole content of myself and not just one or two layers, then there obviously must be no condemnation. Then I must be open to every thought, to every feeling, to all the moods, to all the suppressions; and as there is more and more expansive awareness, there is greater and greater freedom from all the hidden movement of thoughts, motives and pursuits. So, awareness is freedom, it brings freedom, it yields freedom. Whereas, introspection cultivates conflict, the process of self-enclosure; therefore in it there is always frustration and fear.

The questioner also wants to know who is aware. Now, when you have a profound experience of any kind, what is taking place? When there is such an experience, are you aware that you are experiencing? When you are angry, at the split second of anger or of jealousy or of joy, are you aware that you are joyous or that you are angry? It is only when the experience is over that there is the experiencer and the experienced. Then the experiencer observes the



experienced, the object of experience. But at the moment of experience, there is neither the observer nor the observed: there is only the experiencing. Now, most of us are not experiencing. We are always outside the state of experiencing, and therefore we ask this question as to who is the observer, who is it that is aware. Surely, such a question is a wrong question, is it not? The moment there is experiencing, there is neither the person who is aware nor the object of which he is aware. There is neither the observer nor the observed, but only a state of experiencing. Most of us find it is extremely difficult to live in a state of experiencing, because that demands an extraordinary pliability, a quickness, a high degree of sensitivity; and that is denied when we are pursuing a result, when we want to succeed, when we have an end in view, when we are calculating - all of which brings frustration. But a man who does not demand anything, who is not seeking an end, who is not searching out a result with all its implications, such a man is in a state of constant experiencing. Everything then has a movement, a meaning, and nothing is old; nothing is charred, nothing is repetitive, because what is, is never old. The challenge is always new. It is only the response to the challenge that is old; and the old creates further residue, which is memory, the observer, who separates himself from the observed, from the challenge, from the experience. You can experiment with this for yourself very simply and very easily. Next time you are angry or jealous or greedy or violent or whatever it be, watch yourself. In that state, 'you' are not. There is only that state of being. But the moment, the second afterwards, you term it, you name it, you call it jealousy, anger, greed. So, you have created immediately the observer and the

observed, the experiencer and the experienced. When there is the experiencer and the experienced, then the experiencer tries to modify the experience, change it, remember things about it, and so on, and therefore maintains the division between himself and the experienced. But if you don't name that feeling - which means, you are not seeking a result, you are not condemning, you are merely silently aware of the feeling - , then you will see that in that state of feeling, of experiencing there is no observer and no observed; because, the observer and the observed are a joint phenomenon, and there is only experiencing. So, introspection and awareness are entirely different. Introspection leads to frustration, to further conflict, for in it is implied the desire for change, and change is merely a modified continuity. Whereas, awareness is a state in which there is no condemnation, no justification or identification, and therefore there is understanding; and in that state of passive, alert awareness, there is neither the experiencer nor the experienced.

Sir, what I am saying is not very difficult, though you may find it verbally difficult. But you will notice, when you yourself are interested in something very gravely and very deeply, this actually takes place. You are so completely submerged in the thing in which you are interested that there is no exclusion, no concentration. Introspection, which is a form of self-improvement, of self-expansion, can never lead to truth, because it is always a process of self-enclosure; whereas, awareness is a state in which truth can come into being, the truth of what is, the simple truth of daily existence. It is only when we understand the truth of daily existence that we can go far. You must begin near to go far; but

most of us want to jump, to begin far without understanding what is close. As we understand the near, we will find the distance between the near and the far is not. There is no distance - the beginning and the end are one.

Question: Is marriage a need or a luxury?

Krishnamurti: Now, let us examine the problem, the question. Why do we marry? First, obviously, because of biological necessity, the sexual urge, which society has legalized by marriage. Society wants to protect the children and not have them illegitimate, because it looks upon illegitimate children with horror. Therefore, marriage is legalized. But surely, that is not the only reason why we marry. We marry because of psychological demands. I need a companion, somebody I can possess, dominate, somebody I can call mine. I can do with my wife what I like, she is subordinate to man - in this country, not in America. Here, the marriage system has made the woman a slave, to be protected, controlled, dominated, possessed. Don't look at somebody else, Sirs; you are all involved in it. Woman is a possession; as I possess property, so I possess my wife. I possess her sexually and dominate her outwardly. Psychologically, possession gives me comfort, security: my property, my wife, my children - the horror of it all. We treat human beings as we treat material goods, without any consideration; because, once I possess you legally, you are under me. So, society legalizes marriage in order to perpetuate the race, to hold it within limits; but psychologically, inwardly, I can do what I like. And you know the whole business of existence, the horrors, the agonies, the miseries, of those who are married and who don't love each other. How can there be love when there is

possessiveness? And if you don't marry, what happens? I have seen that in several countries; there is what is called companionate marriage. Don't look shocked. Again, if there is no love, companionate marriage becomes an easy way out for your sexual appetite and irresponsibility. So, without love, both are a horror. But society does not care two pins whether there is love or not; and as most of us are so concentrated, so engrossed in our business life, in making money or whatever it be, as we are ruthless in our business and cruel in the world, how can we possibly have love for anyone at home? You cannot on the one hand exploit your neighbour, starve him out, suck the blood out of him, and then go home and have affection for your wife. No, Sirs, you cannot do both. But that is what you are trying to do, and that is why you have no love. That is why marriage throughout the world is such a miserable affair.

Marriage is also a form of self-perpetuation. I want continuity through my children. Therefore, children become very important, not in themselves, but for my own continuity - my name, my class, my caste. You know the whole business. And naturally, when you are merely using children for your own continuity, there is no love. How can there be when you are more interested in your own continuity through them, than in loving them, whatever they are? Therefore, tradition and name become very important, because they are the means of perpetuating yourself through your children.

So, to understand this problem, to find out what it involves, we must study it, go into it. In studying there comes intelligence, and only intelligence and love can deal with this problem, not legislation. The moment I possess a person, he becomes a

prostitute; that is, the person becomes important, not for himself, but because in myself I am empty, starving, ugly, I am insufficient, poor, so I use another - my wife, my employer, or whoever it be - to cover my inward emptiness. Therefore, the possessed becomes important as a means of escape from my own loneliness; and naturally I grow jealous, envious, when the other, who is helping me to escape from myself, looks at somebody else. So to understand all this human process, which is extremely complex and subtle, one must have intelligence. Intelligence is also love, not mere intellect; and we cannot have love if, on the one hand, we are ruthless in our business, in everyday life, and on the other, try to be gentle, tender and merciful. You cannot do both, you cannot be an ambitious rich man and yet be loving and tender. You cannot be a captain of industry, or a big politician, and yet be merciful. The two don't go together. And it is only when there is love, mercy - which is intelligence, the highest form of intelligence - that this problem can be solved. We are human beings, whether men or women; we are alive, sensitive, we are not doormats to be trampled upon, used sexually or mentally for self-gratification. The moment we regard each other as human beings, as individuals, not as something to be possessed, then there is a possibility of understanding and of going beyond this conflict that exists between two people in marriage,

Question: Who is he that feeds you if not an exploiter? How are you free from exploitation, since you exploit an exploiter?

Krishnamurti: Now, what do we mean by exploitation? Obviously, using another for one's own gratification, which is principally psychological. When I use another psychologically,

then I am really exploiting him; and most of our exploitation in the world - the rich exploiting the poor, the leader exploiting the led, the follower exploiting the leader, and so on - is essentially based on inward demands, on psychological poverty of being. There will be no outward exploitation of man by man when there is a cessation of the inner and entirely psychological demand to use another - whether it be your wife, a labourer, or the man in the office - as a means to enrich yourself. After all, you gather money, prestige, as a means of self-expansion; but you are content with little, with the necessities of life, when you are inwardly rich, when you don't depend upon another as a means of covering up your own psychological demands and emptiness. So, exploitation obviously begins when we use another psychologically as a means of self expansion.

Now, the questioner asks me if I am not exploiting the exploiter. I don't think I am. I am fed by him, as I would be if I went out and earned money. I am not using him as a psychological necessity, nor am I using you, the audience, the individual, in order to expand myself. Therefore, I am not your leader and you are not my follower. I don't need you psychologically, and I have tested this out for myself by not getting on a platform and by ceasing to talk. So, as I would go out and earn money for my needs, I am talking; and for that I am clothed and fed. But as society is constructed at the present time, its whole structure is based on exploitation, which is using another psychologically as a means of self-expansion; and there are only a very few thoughtful people who don't care to use another as a means of self-expansion, and who therefore cease to exploit. Surely, exploitation means far more than exploiting the

labourer. The basis of all exploitation is the psychological demand to use another as a means of self-expansion, as a means of aggression and self-perpetuation. So, where there is no self-expansion, where there is not the use of another psychologically, there is no exploitation. That means you are content with little, not because of an ideal, but because inwardly there is a treasure, there is beauty, ecstasy. But without that inward simplicity, merely to don a loin cloth means nothing; because, you may outwardly have but one cloth, while inwardly you are using and therefore exploiting people. We give so much importance to outward exploitation; the communist, the socialist, everybody is trying to stop outward exploitation. It does not mean that that is wrong; but we should attack the inward causes of exploitation, which are much more complex, much more subtle, and that cannot be done through mere legislation. That is why it is very important for the individual to transform himself. And the transformation of the individual, you and me, is not a question of time. It must be done now. Because, when you transform yourself, the world will be transformed. The world is the place where you live, it is your relationships, your values; and it can be affected immediately when there is a deep, inward revolution in you. And this inward revolution can take place only when you as an individual are not using another for your self-expansion, for your gratification, for your comfort.

Question: Is not stilling the mind a prerequisite for the solution of a problem, and is not the dissolution of a problem a condition of mental stillness?

Krishnamurti: There are two questions involved in this, so we

will take them one by one. "Is not stilling the mind a prerequisite for the solution of a problem?" It all depends on what you call the mind. The mind is not just the superficial layer; consciousness is not merely that dull action of the mind. Obviously, when there is a problem which is created by the superficial mind, the superficial mind has to become quiet in order to understand it. You do that anyhow, it happens in daily life. When you have a business problem, what do you do? You switch off the telephone, you stop your secretary if you have one, and you observe, study the problem - which means your mind is free from other worries. Your superficial mind is concerned with the problem, which means that it has become still. But the superficial mind does not include the whole content of the mind. Your whole consciousness has not become still; only the superficial layer, which is constantly in agitation, has become temporarily quiet.

"And is not the dissolution of a problem a condition of mental stillness?" Obviously. It is only when every problem is completely understood - which means that the problem leaves no residue, no scar, no memory - that the mind becomes still. Consciousness, as we have said, is a process of experiencing, naming or terming, and recording, which is memory. So, consciousness is a process of challenge and response, naming and recording, or memory. That is the whole process of consciousness. The recording, the naming, the experiencing, can be suppressed, held down in one of the deep layers of consciousness; but until that suppression is raised, either through dreams, through action, or through unearthing that hidden thing, there cannot be stillness of the mind. A mind which has many hidden drawers, hidden cupboards with innumerable



skeletons held down by will, by denial, by suppression, how can such a mind be still? It can be driven, willed to be still; but is that stillness? A man who is hanging on to passion, who is lustful and has suppressed it, held it down, how can such a man have a calm, still, rich mind? A man who is tortured by ambition and therefore frustrated, and who tries to fly from that frustration through every means of escape, how can such a man have a still mind? It is only when ambition is understood, when the problems of ambition, with its frustrations, with its conflicts, with its ruthlessness, have been understood, that the mind becomes quiet. By looking into oneself deeply, opening all the cupboards, all the drawers, unearthing all the skeletons and understanding them, then the mind becomes quiet. You cannot have stillness of mind with locked doors. You may still the mind by will, which is an easy escape; but a mind that is made still by the action of will is a dead mind, it is insensitive, it has been brutalized by the action of the will. It is only by giving full freedom to every movement of thought and understanding it - which does not mean licentiousness, evil actions, and so on - , only by understanding the whole content of your being, that the mind becomes still. Then it is not made still; tranquillity comes to it naturally, easily, swiftly. It is like a pond which becomes serene, without a ripple, when the breezes stop. Similarly, the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet, without a movement, absolutely still, when the problems are dissolved.

Now, problems are created by the thinker separating himself from his thought, the actor from his action, thereby giving importance to the actor, to the thinker. And stillness comes to the mind only through self-knowledge - not through denial of the self

or acceptance of the self, but through understanding every movement, every thought, every feeling of the self, both the high and the low. The high and the low is a false division the mind has indulged in. There is only thought, which divides itself as the high and the low; and to understand thought, the whole process of thought, one must have self-knowledge. That means every thought must be understood, felt out, without condemnation. There must be silent, swift awareness; and out of that self-knowledge there comes an extraordinary quietness, a stillness that is creative, a stillness in which reality comes into being. But to pursue stillness and to cultivate stillness destroys that creative reality, because you are pursuing stillness, exercising your will to become still. as a means of getting a result, of obtaining something. A man who is seeking a result, an end, who is trying to acquire truth by forcing the mind, by making it still, will never find that reality. He is only dulling himself, escaping from the cupboards, from the skeletons that are holding him. It is only by inviting sorrow that you can understand reality, not by escaping from tribulations.

Question: Since the motive power in the search for truth is interest, what creates interest? What creates interest in a relevant question? Is it suffering?

Krishnamurti: Obviously, where there is no interest, there is no search. Where there is no interest, there may be control, domination, effort; but there is search, enquiry, only where there is interest. That very search is devotion. Devotion is not a separate path to reality. Where there is search, there is action; and there is no separate path of karma yoga. Because, where there is enquiry, there is action, and that very search brings wisdom. So, interest is

essential; and how does interest come into being? Interest comes into being, obviously, when you are suffering, when you want to know what are the causes of suffering because you are caught in it, or because you see another caught in it. Surely, there is no other way but the way of sorrow. But when you suffer, you seek remedies, palliatives, escapes, gurus, which dissipates your enquiry into suffering. When you are worried, when you are suffering, your instinct is to run away from it, to take flight from it, to seek a verbal explanation or any other means to get away from it.

Whereas, if you observe suffering without escaping, without condemning it - which is extremely arduous - , then you will find that it begins to tell you extraordinary things, it begins to reveal untold treasures. So, your difficulty is not that you don't suffer, but that you dissipate your energies in trying to overcome suffering.

What is overcome has to be overcome again and again, and therefore you go on suffering. Suffering does not lead to intelligence when you try to overcome it; whereas, if you begin to understand it, then it leads you to intelligence. And if you examine is yourself, you will see that when there is suffering you want a hand to hold you, a guru to tell you what to do; or you turn on the radio, you escape to the cinema or the racecourse, or you do innumerable things - you pray, you do puja, to get away from the suffering, from the actual throbbing pain. These are all means of dissipating your energies; but if you don't do any of them, what happens? There is suffering, and the paralysis of that suffering; then, in the silence of that suffering, when the mind is no longer escaping, you are living with suffering. You are not condemning it, you are not identifying yourself with it, therefore it begins to reveal

its causes. You have not searched out its causes - to search out the cause of suffering is another form of escape. Whereas, if you are simply aware of suffering without condemnation, the cause of that suffering is revealed. Then suffering begins to unfold its story chapter by chapter, and you see all the implications; and the more you read the book of suffering, the greater the wisdom. Therefore, when you escape from suffering, you are really escaping from wisdom. Wisdom can be found in any sorrow; you don't have to have great crises. Wisdom is there for him who seeks, who does not shun, who does not escape, who does not take flight, but who is passively, alertly, aware of what is. In that alert, passive awareness, the full meaning of what is, is understood. When it is understood, truth comes into being; and it is truth that frees one from sorrow, it is truth that gives bliss, it is truth that gives freedom, and in that state, sorrow is completely dissolved. As sorrow is negative, sorrow must be approached negatively; any positive action towards sorrow is an escape. It is only through the highest form of thinking, which is negative thinking, that there is understanding; and where there is understanding, there is stillness, there is tranquillity. Then truth frees thought from all problems.

March 21, 1948

## **BOMBAY 12TH PUBLIC TALK 28TH MARCH, 1948**

As this is the last talk, I will try to make a brief resume of what we have all been discussing and talking about during the last three months. Naturally, it has to be rather concise and may perhaps be puzzling at first; but if you will kindly think it over, I believe certain things will be clear, even though others may need further explanation, more going into - which we have been trying to do during the discussions. But I think the obvious fact remains that most of us have many problems, many anxieties and conflicts, and we appear not to be able to solve them. I think it is because we don't see the picture clearly, we don't read the problem deeply and carefully, without prejudice, whatever it be - whether emotional, psychological, intellectual, social, or economic. The problem itself contains the answer; the answer is not away from the problem. Our whole question, then, is how to read the problem very clearly and swiftly, because the problem is never the same. It is constantly varying, moving, never still. It is like a swift-running river. And to understand such a problem, we must understand the creator of the problem, which is the mind, the self, the 'I'. But most of us are made happy by things created by the hand or by the mind; we are content with things, produced either by the machine, or by ideation, by thought, by belief. But things made by the hand or by the mind are all sensate; they soon wear out and pass away, as by constant use a machine wears itself out. So, things made by the hand wear themselves out; and so do things produced by the mind - the idea, the opinion, the belief, the tenet. The value of these things

made by the mind soon wears away, and so there is a constant struggle to maintain permanency in those things which are inherently impermanent. The things made by the hand are misused by the mind. Food, clothing, and shelter, are given wrong values by the mind; and a mind that gives wrong values creates misery. Our conflict, then, arises from the values which the mind establishes for the things made by the hand; and in their misuse lies our misery.

So, the mind, which is the intellect, with its will and its capacity for evaluation, must be understood; because, as long as the mind is not understood, with its desires, with its pursuits and the capacity to evaluate according to its prejudices, notions, knowledge - as long as the mind is not understood, obviously there is conflict, there is misery. Will, after all, is the expression of desire, the outcome of craving, of the desire to be; and as long as that will - with the capacity to evaluate, which is the function of the intellect - is not gone into deeply, understood, and given its full significance, there is bound to be conflict, there is bound to be misery. So, if there is no understanding of will, of the intellect, and of the creations of the mind - which are not separate processes, but a total process - , there is bound to be conflict; and the understanding of the mind is self-knowledge. Self-knowledge makes one straight. What is crooked is the evaluator, the interpreter, the misuser, the corrupter, that is, the mind; and as long as there is no self-knowledge, which is awareness of the process of the mind, of the 'I', there must be wrong evaluation of things made by the hand or by the mind, and therefore there must be conflict, misery. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, and without self-knowledge there is no happiness.

So, in order to understand a problem, however complex it may appear, whether it is an economic, social, or psychological problem, one must be able to see it clearly, without distortion; but this is not possible as long as there is no self-knowledge. And self-knowledge cannot be realized as long as there is no meditation. Because, meditation is a process of continual revelation of every thought and every feeling; it is not the fixation on a particular picture or idea, but a constant awareness, a constant understanding of every thought, every feeling, as they arise. Meditation is not choosing one particular form and dwelling upon it, but it is a continual discovery of the meaning of every thought and of every feeling. To do this, there must be no condemnation. Our problem is sorrow, the sorrow that exists in relationship, the sorrow that comes through wrong valuation, the sorrow that comes through ignorance; and sorrow can be dissipated, dissolved, only when there is the unfolding of self-knowledge. That knowledge is not of the higher self or of the lower self - which is a division within the field of the mind, and therefore a false division, a self-protective division without any reality. Self-knowledge is awareness of the self without division; and as long as there is no self-knowledge, the multiplication and re-creation of our problems will continue. That is why the individual is enormously significant. For he is the only transformer, he alone can bring about a revolution in his relationship, and therefore a revolution in the world, the world of his relationship. Only through self-knowledge can there be transformation, and this transformation cannot come into being through any miracle, through book learning, but only through constant experimentation, through constant discovery of the

process of one's being. This process is a total process, and not a separative process. It is not in antagonism to the world, because the individual is a total process, he is a result of the world. Without the world, without the other, without relationship, the individual is not; and he who would be transformed and realize happiness cannot isolate himself. Only when there is constant discovery of the activities of the self, of the 'I', with its cravings, anxieties, pursuits and false creations, only when there is complete understanding of the ways of the self, the hidden and the open workings of the mind - only then can there be happiness. Happiness comes not in evaluating, but when the mind is not occupied with itself, when the mind is silent, then happiness comes into being; and such a happy man can then resolve the problems about him.

Question: Why don't you do miracles? All teachers did.

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by miracles? Healing the physically sick, and those who are sick psychologically? Both these things have been done. Others have done it, and I also have done it. But surely that is not important, is it? To be healed psychologically is more important than to be healed physically, because psychological illness affects the body, which in turn brings about disease. Therefore, the psychological state of health is far more important than physical health - which does not mean that we must deny physical well-being; but mere concentration on physical health will not bring about psychological well being. Whereas, if there is a transformation in the psyche, in the mind, then that will inevitably effect the well-being of the physical. So, the miracle which we all want, which we are all waiting to see happen, is really a sign of laziness, of irresponsibility. We want somebody else to do



the job for us. If I may talk about myself, I also at one time did healing; but I found it was far more important to heal the mind, the inward state of being. Because, when each one of us can find inward riches, then there will be an amelioration of physical ill health. Merely to concentrate on healing the outward may make for popularity, draw large groups, but it will not lead man to happiness. So, we should concentrate on healing the inward emptiness, the inward disease, the inward corruption, the inward distortion - and that can be done only by you. None can heal you inwardly, and that is the miracle of it. A doctor can heal you outwardly, a psychoanalyst can help you to be normal, to fit into society; but to go beyond that, which means to be really healthy, to be inwardly true, clear, wholly uncorrupted - that you alone can do, and no one else; and I think that to heal oneself completely and surely is the greatest miracle. That is what we have been doing here during the last three months: seeing for ourselves the causes of inward disease, inward conflict, inward contradiction, seeing things as they are, very clearly, purely and precisely; and when all things are seen clearly, then the miracle happens. Because, when that which is, is perceived without distortion, there is understanding; and that understanding brings a healing quality. But understanding can come only through your own individual awareness and not through the miracle of another, not through the impression, the influence, the compulsion, or the imposition of the idea of another. Surely, miracles do happen. They are happening all the time, only we are not aware of it. Physically and psychologically, inwardly as well as outwardly, you are not the same today as yesterday. The body is undergoing transformation

all the time, and so is the inward nature, the mind; and if we can follow it easily and swiftly, then we will see what an extraordinary miracle is happening in us and about us - the miracle being the constant newness, the freshness of life, the infinite beauty, the pliability, the depth of existence. But one cannot follow swiftly if one is tethered, if one is bound, if one is ceaselessly occupied with one's own achievements, anxieties and pursuits. For a man who is ambitious, there is no miracle, because he knows what he wants and he achieves it; but the man who is uncertain, who asks nothing, to him life is a miracle, a miracle of constant renewal; and we shall miss that renewal if we are merely seeking a result, an end.

Question: You have said that some transformation has taken place in all your listeners. Presumably, they have to wait for the manifestations of that transformation. How then can you call it immediate?

Krishnamurti: Surely, as long as we are looking for transformation, there will be no transformation. As long as we think in terms of yesterday, today and tomorrow, there can obviously be no transformation, because the mind is still caught in the net of time. If I want to change immediately, now, if that is my intention, then it is not possible, because I am thinking in terms of time, of today and tomorrow. As long as we are thinking in terms of time, of the present and the future, there cannot be transformation, because then transformation is merely a change, a continuity; but the moment thought is free from time, then there is a timeless transformation which is not a contradiction. That is, as long as a problem is thought about, the problem will continue. Thought, which is the result of the past, creates the problem; and

that which is the result of the past cannot resolve the problem. It can look at it, it can examine it, it can analyze it, but it cannot resolve the problem. The problem - any problem whether a mathematical problem, a problem of relationship, or a problem of ideation - is resolved only when the thought process comes to an end, only when the mind, which is thought, the result of many yesterdays, ceases. That which is the result of time cannot bring about transformation; and when it does, either there will be a change which is a modified continuity, or the problem will become more complex. Whereas, if there is passive awareness of the problem, observation of it without condemnation or justification, then you will see there is an immediate transformation, an immediate cessation of that problem. After all, when we talk about transformation, what do we mean? The cessation of a problem, surely. Why does a man want to be transformed? Because he is in misery, in conflict, because he has daily anxieties; and there can be transformation, resolution of the problem, only when the mind, the thinker who is the creator of that problem, understands himself - which means, when the thought process about a problem comes to an end. You do this always when there is an acute problem. You think about it, you worry about it, and thought can go no further; and you leave it. Then in that quietness the problem is understood and resolved, and in that moment there is immediate transformation. Sir, if you are aware of it, this is the process that we are going through daily, is it not? As a farmer cultivates the field in the spring, then sows and harvests, and lets the field lie fallow during the winter, so, if we are aware, we will see that the mind is cultivating, sowing, and harvesting; but, unfortunately, it

never allows itself to lie fallow, and it is in that fallowness, as with the field, that there is renewal. As during the winter time, through rains, through storms, through sunshine, the field rejuvenates itself, so the mind re-creates and renews itself when every problem is dissolved. That is, by cultivating, by going fully deeply and completely into each problem, there is the death of that problem, and therefore a renewal. Experiment with this and you will see how extraordinarily quickly and easily every problem is resolved when it is seen very clearly, distinctly, and purely. But to see a problem very clearly, without distortion, you have to give your full attention to it - and that is where the difficulty lies. Our minds are constantly distracted, escaping, because to see a problem clearly might mean action which would bring about further disturbance; and so the mind constantly avoids facing the problem, thereby increasing that problem. But when the thing is seen very clearly, without distortion, then you will find that the problem itself has an answer.

So, as long as we think in terms of transformation, there cannot be transformation, either now or hereafter. Transformation comes into being immediately when every problem is understood as it arises, and the immediacy of that transformation depends on your understanding of the problem. You understand a problem only when there is no condemnation or justification, when you really look at it, when you can love the problem. Then you will see that that problem gives its answer, and therefore there is freedom; and at that moment of freedom there is a renewal, there is a transformation. The mind has renewed itself and is therefore free to attack the next problem that arises. Sir, life need not be a succession of problems. Life is a challenge and a response; the

challenge is always new, and if the response is always conditioned by the old, then problems continue to arise. But if the response is as new as the challenge, then there is constant renewal, constant transformation; and the response is new only when thought, which is the product of memory - psychological, not factual memory - is understood and not stored up. Then the response is as new as the challenge, and therefore life is a constant movement, an effortless being in which there is bliss - not this constant struggle to become, to transform oneself into something.

Question: What are the foundations of right livelihood? How can I find out whether my livelihood is right, and how am I to find right livelihood in a basically wrong society?

Krishnamurti: In a basically wrong society, there cannot be right livelihood. What is happening throughout the world at the present time? Whatever livelihood we have brings us to war, to general misery and destruction - which is an obvious fact. Whatever we do inevitably leads to conflict, to decay, to ruthlessness and sorrow. So, the present society is basically wrong; it is founded, is it not?, on envy, hate, and the desire for power; and such a society is bound to create wrong means of livelihood, such as the soldier, the policeman, and the lawyer. By their very nature, they are a disintegrating factor in society, and the more lawyers, policemen, and soldiers there are, the more obvious the decay of society. That is what is happening throughout the world: there are more soldiers, more policemen, more lawyers, and naturally the business man goes with them. So, all that has to be changed in order to found a right society - and we think such a task is impossible. It is not, Sir; but it is you and I who have to do it.

Because, at present, whatever livelihood we undertake either creates misery for another, or leads to the ultimate destruction of mankind - which is shown in our daily existence. So, how can that be changed? It can be changed only when you and I are not seeking power, are not envious, are not full of hatred and antagonism.

When you, in your relationship, bring about that transformation, then you are helping to create a new society, a society in which there are people who are not held by tradition, who do not ask anything for themselves, who are not pursuing power because inwardly they are rich, they have found reality. Only the man who seeks reality can create a new society; only the man who loves can bring about a transformation in the world. I know this is not a satisfactory answer for a person who wants to find out what is the right livelihood in the present structure of society, You must do the best you can in the present structure of society - either become a photographer, a merchant, a lawyer, a policeman, or whatever it is. But if you do, be conscious of what you are doing, be intelligent, be aware, fully cognizant, of what you are perpetuating, recognize the whole structure of society, with its corruption, with its hatred, with its envy; and if you yourself do not yield to these things, then perhaps you will be able to create a new society. But the moment you ask what is right livelihood, all these questions are inevitably there, are they not? Because, you are not satisfied with your livelihood - you want to be envied, you want to have power, you want to have greater comforts and luxuries, position and authority, and therefore you are inevitably creating or maintaining a society which will bring destruction upon man, upon yourself. And if you clearly see that process of destruction in your own livelihood, if

you see that it is the result of your own pursuit of livelihood, then obviously you will find the right means of earning money. But first you must see the picture of society as it is, a disintegrating, corrupted society; and when you see it very clearly, then your means of earning a livelihood will come. But first you must see the picture, see the world as it is, with its national divisions, with its cruelties, ambitions, hatreds and controls. Then, as you see it more clearly, you will find that a right means of livelihood comes into being - you don't have to seek it. But the difficulty with most of us is that we have too many responsibilities; fathers, mothers, are waiting for us to earn money and support them. And as it is difficult to get a job the way society is at the present time, any job is welcome; so we fall into the machinery of society. But those who are not so compelled, who have no need of an immediate job and can therefore look at the whole picture, it is they who are responsible. But, you see, those who are not concerned with an immediate job are caught up in something else - they are concerned with their self-expansion, with their comforts, with their luxuries, with their amusements. They have time, but are dissipating it. And those who have time are responsible for the alteration of society; those who are not immediately pressed for a livelihood should really concern themselves with this whole problem of existence, and not get entangled in mere political action, in superficial activities. Those who have time and so-called leisure should seek out truth, because it is they who can bring about a revolution in the world, not the man whose stomach is empty. But, unfortunately, those who have leisure are not occupied with the eternal. They are occupied in filling their time. Therefore, they also are a cause of

misery and confusion in the world. So, those of you who are listening, those of you who have a little time, should give thought and consideration to this problem, and by your own transformation you will bring about a world revolution.

Question: How can a man who has never reached the limits of his mind go beyond his mind to experience direct communion with truth?

Krishnamurti: Sir when you know the limits of your mind, are you not already beyond the limits? To be aware of your limits is surely the first step, the first process - which is very difficult, because the limits of the mind are erroneously subtle. In knowing that I am limited, in being aware of it without condemnation, there is already a freedom from that limitation, is there not? Surely, to know that I am a liar, to be aware of it without condemnation, without justification, is already a freedom from lying. To know the limits of the mind is already a tremendous liberation, isn't it? To know that I am tethered to a belief is already freedom from that limitation; but a mind which justifies that belief, that bondage, defending it and saying, 'It is alright, I need it', such a mind can never know its limitation. When I know that I am tethered, limited by a belief, and am aware of that limitation without condemnation or justification, that is already a liberation from belief. Sir, experiment with this and you will see how extraordinarily active, how extraordinarily true it is. To know, to beware of a problem, is to be free from it; and a mind cannot experience truth if it does not know its limitation. That is why it is very important to have self-knowledge. Self-knowledge is not an ultimate goal, it is not the ultimate end. Self-knowledge is knowing one's limitation from



moment to moment, and therefore perceiving the truth from moment to moment. Truth which is continuous is not truth, because that which continues can never renew itself; but in ending, there is a renewal. So, a mind that is not aware of its own limitation can never experience truth; but if the mind is aware of its limitation without condemnation, without justification, if it is purely aware of its limitation, then you will find there comes a freedom from the limitation; and in that freedom, truth is realized. There is not 'you' unified to truth: 'you' can never find truth. 'You' must cease for truth to come into being, because 'you' are the limitation. So, you must understand where you are limited, the extent of your limitation; you must be passively aware of it, and in that passivity truth comes into being. Light cannot be unified with darkness. That which is ignorance cannot become one with wisdom. Ignorance must cease for wisdom to be. Wisdom is not an ultimate end, but it comes into being when ignorance is dissolved from moment to moment. Wisdom is not an accumulation, which gives continuity; wisdom is understanding the problem completely each minute, each second. So, wisdom, reality, is not caught in the net of time. Only through self-knowledge can the limitations, which the self has created, come to an end, and these limitations can be understood only from moment to moment as they arise. And each limitation, as you observe it, brings the truth, each moment you see the false, the truth is perceived; but to see the false as the false, and the truth as truth, is difficult, is arduous; it demands clarity of perception. A mind that is distracted can never see the false as the false, and the true as the true; and to see the truth in the false requires a swiftness of mind, a mind that is not tethered to any

bondage, to any limitation.

Question: Attachment is the stuff of which we are made. How can we be free from attachment?

Krishnamurti: Surely, attachment is not the problem, is it? Why are you attached, and why do you want to be detached? Why is there this constant strife between attachment and detachment? You know what is meant by attachment - the desire to possess a person, to possess things. Sir, why are you attached? What would happen if you were not attached? Surely, attachment becomes a problem only when there is the pursuit of detachment, only when that which is attached is not understood. Now, take an example. If you examine yourself, why are you attached to your wife, to your husband, to your money, to your house, to your property, to your ideas? Why? Because, without that person, you are lost, you are empty; without property, without a name, you are nothing; and without your bank account, without your ideas, what are you? An empty shell, aren't you? So, because you are afraid of being nothing, you are attached to something; and being attached - with all its problems, with its fears, with its cruelties, with its anxieties and frustrations - , you try to become detached, you try to renounce property, renounce your family, renounce your ideas. But you have not really solved the problem, which is the fear of being nothing - and that is why you are attached. After all, you are nothing. Strip yourself of your titles, of your M.A.'s, of your professions and little qualities, of your houses and properties, of your few jewels, and all the rest of it - and what are you? Knowing inwardly that there is an extraordinary emptiness, a void, a nothingness, and being afraid of it, you depend, you are attached, you possess; and in that possession, there

is appalling cruelty. You are not concerned about another, you are only concerned about yourself - and that you call love. So, because you are afraid, because there is fear of that emptiness, you are willing to kill another, to destroy mankind. Now, why not accept the obvious, which is that you are nothing - not that you should be nothing, but that you are actually nothing? Sir, when you do accept it, there is no renunciation, neither attachment nor detachment. You simply don't possess - and then there is a beauty, then there is a richness, a blessing that you cannot possibly, understand as long as you are afraid of emptiness. Then life is full of significance, then life becomes really a miracle. But a man who is afraid of emptiness, of being nothing, is attached; and with attachment there arises the conflict of detachment, the conflict of renunciation, and all the appalling misery and cruelty that comes with attachment and dependence. A man who is nothing knows love, for love is nothing.

Question: Is extensional awareness the same as creative emptiness? Is not awareness passive and therefore not creative? Is not the process of self-awareness a tedious and painful process?

Krishnamurti: If awareness is practiced, made a habit, then it becomes painful and tedious; but awareness cannot be practiced, cannot be controlled, cannot be made into a conflict, a discipline - and that is the beauty of it. You are aware, or you are not aware. So, anything which is practiced becomes a boredom, tedious, painful, it means the exertion of will and effort, which creates distortion. Now, awareness is not that kind of thing at all. What is awareness, what is it to be aware? To be aware of things about you outwardly, of colour, of faces, of the sunset, of the shadows, of birds in flight, of the restless sea, of the trees in the wind - to be

aware of all that is mere awareness of the superficial. You don't condemn a bird in flight, you merely observe it. But the moment you become aware of your inward nature, then you begin to condemn, you are incapable of looking at it without condemnation or justification. But to understand, there must be no condemnation or justification. So, to be aware, just to observe your thoughts, just to know what you are thinking and feeling without condemnation, without defence, without justification - surely, to be simply aware is not tedious, is not painful. But if you say, 'I must be aware in order to get a result', then it becomes tedious. If you try to be aware in order to eradicate anger, jealousy, possessiveness, or whatever it be, then it becomes painful. Such awareness is not awareness. That is merely a process of introspection, trying to become something. In awareness, there is no becoming, but merely observation, a silent observation - as when you visit the cinema and see the film. Now, if you can observe, if you can be aware of yourself in action, in movement, without identification, then you will find that there is an extensional awareness. It begins, as I said, with superficial things. Then, as you go deeper and deeper, there is wide, extensional awareness. That awareness is necessary, because in that awareness all the hidden layers, all the hidden intimations, come into being. As there is deeper and wider, more extensional awareness, the intimations, the conflicts of the hidden, are dissolved; and then you will find there comes creative emptiness. This is all a total process, not a step-by-step process; because, in awareness, there is neither beginning nor ending. It is one whole process. The moment you observe a problem without condemnation, there is bound to be passive awareness; and when

there is passive awareness, there is dissolution of the problem. That is, in passive awareness there is creative stillness, creative emptiness. Then, in that creative emptiness, reality comes into being, which dissolves the problem. So, where there is pain conflict, a tedious feeling, boredom, there is no awareness, but only a dull mind. Whereas, contrary to dullness, in awareness there is heightened sensitivity, and passive awareness is creative. The highest form of thinking is negative thinking; and when there is complete cessation of thought, when there is that passivity which is not a sleepy state, then there is creative being. I don't know if you have noticed that when the mind is full of problems, when the mind is full of thoughts, there is no creation. Only when the mind is empty, when the mind is still, when it has no problem, when it is alertly passive - only in that emptiness is there creation. Creation can only take place in negation, which is not the opposite of positive assertion. I am not using the word `negation' as the opposite of the positive. Being nothing is not the antithesis of being something. Being nothing is not related to being something. When the `being something' ceases completely, then there is nothingness. Only when all the problems which mind creates have ceased, when the mind is nothing, empty - which is not induced by discipline, by control - , only then does that passive, alert awareness come into being. And passivity must exist if a problem is to be dissolved. You can understand a problem only when you don't condemn it, when you don't justify it, when you are capable of looking at it silently, and that is not possible when you are seeking a result. A problem exists only in the search for a result; and the problem ceases if there is no search for a result. When the mind is silently

observing, and therefore passive, there comes creative being, and creative being is a constant renewal. It is not continuity, it is a timeless state of being. In that state alone can there be creation, and therefore that state alone is revolution.

Question: What do you mean by love?

Krishnamurti: Now, again we are going to discover by understanding what love is not; because, as love is the unknown, we must come to it by discarding the known. Surely, the unknown cannot be discovered by a mind that is full of the known. So, what we are going to do is to find out the values of the known, look at the known; and when that is looked at purely, without condemnation, the mind becomes free from the known, and then we shall know what love is. So, we must approach love negatively, not positively.

Now, what is love with most of us? When we say we love somebody, what do we mean? We mean we possess that person. From that possession arises jealousy, because if I lose him or her what happens? I feel empty, lost, Therefore, I legalize possession. I hold him or her. From holding, possessing that person, there is jealousy, there is fear, and all the innumerable conflicts that arise from possession. Surely, is not love, is it? Don't shake your heads in assent; for if you agree with me, you are merely agreeing verbally, and such agreement has no meaning at all. You can agree only when you don't possess your property, your wife, your ideas.

Obviously, love is not sentiment. To be sentimental, to be emotional, is not love, because sentimentality and emotion are mere sensations. A religious person who weeps about Jesus or Krishna, about his guru or somebody else, is merely sentimental,

emotional. He is indulging in sensation, which is a process of thought, and thought is not love. Thought is the result of sensation. So, the person who is sentimental, who is emotional, cannot possibly know love. Again, aren't we emotional and sentimental? Sentimentality, emotionalism, is merely a form of self-expansion. To be full of emotion is obviously not love, because a sentimental person can be cruel when his sentiments are not responded to, when his feelings have no outlet. An emotional person can be stirred to hatred, to war, to butchery. And a man who is sentimental, full of tears for his religion, surely such a man has no love. Obviously there is no love when there is no real respect, when you don't respect another, whether he is your servant or your friend. Have you not noticed that you are not respectful, kindly, generous, to your servants, to people who are so-called 'below' you? But you have respect for those above, for your boss; for the millionaire, for the man with a large house and a title, for the man who can give you a better position, a better job, from whom you can get something. But you kick those below you, you have a special language for them. So, where there is no respect, there is no love; where there is no mercy, no pity, no forgiveness, there is no love. And as most of us are in this state, we have no love. We are neither respectful nor merciful nor generous. We are possessive, full of sentiment and emotion which can be turned either way: to kill, to butcher, or to unify over some foolish, ignorant intention. So, how can there be love? You can know love only when all these things have stopped, come to an end, only when you don't possess, when you are not merely emotional with devotion to an object. Such devotion is a supplication, selecting something in a different

form. A man who prays does not know love. Since you are possessive, since you seek an end, a result, through devotion, through prayer, which makes you sentimental, emotional, naturally there is no love; and obviously there is no love when there is no respect. You may say that you have respect, but your respect is for the superior, it is merely the respect that comes from wanting something, the respect of fear. If you really felt respect, you would be respectful to the lowest as well as to the so-called highest; and since you haven't that, there is no love. How few of us are generous, forgiving, merciful! You are generous when it pays you, you are merciful when you can see something in return. So, when these things disappear, when these things don't occupy your mind, and when the things of the mind don't fill your heart, then there is love; and love alone can transform the present madness and insanity in the world - not systems, not theories, Either of the left or of the right. You really love only when you do not possess, when you are not envious, not greedy, when you are respectful, when you have mercy and compassion, when you have consideration for your wife, your children, your neighbour, your unfortunate servants who have not a day off, who have become your slaves. When you are respectful to them, not merely to your gurus, to the man above you, then you will know love. That love alone can transform the world, that alone can fill the world with mercy, with beauty. But if you fill your hearts with the things made by the mind or by the hand, then there is no love; and since your hearts are filled by these things, you are in constant battle with each other. But if you realize, if you are aware of all these things without coming into conflict with them, then there is a freedom,



and in that freedom there is love which is not a theory. You can experience love with its blessings, with its perfume, with its loveliness, only when 'you' cease to be, when `you' cease to achieve, to become something; and such love alone can transform the world.

Question: May we request you to state clearly whether there is God or not?

Krishnamurti: Sir, why do you want to know? What difference does it make if I state it clearly or not? Either I will confirm you in your belief, or shake you in your belief. If I confirm your belief, then you will be pleased, and you will go on with your sweet, ugly ways. If I disturb you, you will say, `Well, that is not important', and unfortunately you will still carry on as you are. But why do you want to know? Surely, that is more important than to find out whether there is God or not. To know God, Sir, to know truth, you must not seek it. If you seek it, then you are escaping from what is; and that is why you are asking whether there is God or not. You want to get away from your suffering, escape into an illusion. Your books are full of gods, every temple is full of images made by the hand; but there is no God, because they are all escapes from your actual suffering. To find reality, or rather for reality to come into being, suffering must cease; and merely to search for God, for truth, for immortality, is an escape from suffering. But it is more pleasant to discuss whether there is God or not than to dissolve the causes of suffering, and that is why you have innumerable books discussing the nature of God. The man who discusses the nature of God, does not know God; because, that reality cannot be measured. It cannot be caught in the garland of words. You cannot catch the

wind in your fist; you cannot capture reality in a temple, nor in puja, nor in innumerable ceremonies. They are all escapes, like taking a drink. You take a drink, get drunk, because you want to escape; similarly, you go to a temple, do puja, perform rituals, or whatever it is you do - they are all escapes from that which is. And that which is, is suffering, the constant battle with oneself, and therefore with another; and until you understand and transcend that suffering, reality cannot come into being. So, your enquiry whether there is God or not, is vain, it has no meaning, it can but lead to illusion. How can a mind that is caught in the turmoil of daily sorrow and suffering, in ignorance and limitation, know that which is illimitable, unutterable? How can that which is a product of time, know the timeless? It cannot. Therefore, it cannot even think about it. To think about truth, to think about God, is another form of escape; for God, truth, cannot be caught by thought. Thought is the result of time of yesterday, of the past; and being the result of time, of the past, being the product of memory, how can thought find that which is eternal, timeless, immeasurable? As it cannot, all that you can do is to free the mind from the thought process; and to free the mind from the thought process, you must understand suffering, and not escape from it - suffering not only on the physical level, but at all the different levels of consciousness. That means being open, vulnerable to suffering, not defending yourself against suffering but living with it, embracing it, looking at it. Because, you are suffering now. You are suffering from morning till night, with an occasional ray of sunshine, with an occasional gap in the cloudy sky. Since you are suffering, why not consider that, why not go into it fully, deeply, completely, and resolve it? And that is not

difficult. The search for God is much more difficult, because it is the unknown, and you cannot search for the unknown. But you can seek out the cause of suffering and eradicate it by understanding it, being aware of it, not running away from it. Since you have run away from suffering through various escapes, look at all those escapes, put them away and come face to face with suffering. In understanding that suffering, there is a release. Then the mind becomes free from all thought, it is no longer the product of the past. Then the mind is tranquil, without any problem; it is not made tranquil, but is tranquil, because it has no problem, it is no longer creating thought. Then thought has ceased - thought which is memory, which is the accumulation of experience, the scars of yesterday; and when the mind is utterly quiet, not made quiet, reality comes into being. That experience is the experience of reality, not of illusion, and such experience gives a blessing to man. Truth, love, is the unknown, and the unknown cannot be captured by the known. The known must cease for the unknown to be; and when the unknown comes into being, there is a blessing.

March 28, 1948

## **FOREWORD BY R. MADHAVACHARI MADRAS APRIL 1948**

During Krishnamurti's stay at Madras in April 1948, several persons interested in his teachings met him regularly and discussed with him various problems about Life and Reality, which affect them in their daily life, with a view to understanding those problems and discovering what they were seeking in life.

These notes were prepared by me at the conclusion of each meeting. They are now published at the request of friends who consider them to be a help in understanding Krishnamurti's teachings.

These notes are not authentic, nor have they been read or revised by Krishnamurti.

**R. MADHAVACHARI.**

## **MADRAS 1ST GROUP DISCUSSION 11TH APRIL, 1948**

As these discussions will be for about three weeks, I would like, if I may, to go to the root of the problem direct and not beat about the bush. To deal with the problem directly, we must take a general view of the world's affairs; then, we can see the deterioration of the world's condition. Obviously, a social revolution, a revolution in the values of society, cannot take place; when we attempt to change society, such a change will only be a modified continuity. So, as long as we are looking to a social structure to be changed, including the leftist revolution in the outward structure of society, such a change will not be a revolution. Society is always static; only in the individual can there be a radical revolution. Leftists, Marxists, and Socialists regard revolution as an outward transformation; this really is mere change or modified continuity which implies a pattern, adjustment to a pattern, or a preconceived pattern which needs adjustment; therefore, it is not a revolution. Every social change which we all want, is only a modified continuity of 'what is' and not a revolution.

Question: Will you please explain modified continuity?

Krishnamurti: Change implies modified continuity. What do you mean by change? It is a change from this to that. To bring about a change implies an end in view. I am this and I want to be that. The society is this and I want it to be changed into that. Therefore, change is preconceived, an action within a pattern; it is only a modification in the same field.

When we say we want a change, a social change, does it not

imply a change towards the known - intellectual, factual or utopian? Is that a radical transformation, or a continuation in the same field though in a different direction?

Question: Is not a revolution a hop within the same framework?

Krishnamurti: Surely not. What do we mean by change? When the Communists, Fascists or Socialists demand a change, what do they mean? Any change of pattern of action is still within the known pattern and therefore a modified continuity.

Our problem is therefore entirely different. Transformation is not modified continuity but quite a different process. To understand what complete transformation means, we must understand what change means.

Question: Is change what is intended by a human being or what happens without any intention on the part of man, just like that due to industrialization for instance? Can't we have a change of the outer without a change in the inner?

Krishnamurti: Any change which we desire is a modified continuity of the same thing as now exists. For instance, when we deliberately set about to change the present system in regard to the outer conditions leading to war, is not all such change the same thing continued in a different form? We want a continuity of what we like and a discontinuity of what we do not like.

Question: Is biological growth a change?

Krishnamurti: The growth of a tree is not a change but a growth of the same tree. Obviously, we are referring only to changes due to human action and not to what occurs in nature. Mere social transformation, i.e., changing the outer into something else is not a revolution; it is merely a change which is modified continuity.

Society is static. The individual only is creative and not society. When the individual thinks in terms of change, change being only modified continuity, whatever the individual creates will be static. The moment an act is complete, it is static. If the relationship between two individuals be mere static adjustment, it produces a society which is static. If the relationship is revolutionary and based on a different sense of values, then the individual will be creative. Therefore, continuous revolution is in relationship with people; and one has to start with oneself, the individual, and not with the society.

When one thinks of change of the society, such a change will only be a modification, however violent it may appear. This is what is taking place in the world. The opposite is invariably the continuity of the same in a different form, whether political or otherwise. Therefore, revolution can start only with the individual, with the 'me'.

Question: Is the opposite a continuity of 'what is'?

Krishnamurti: I do not want to go into this now.

When we talk about social revolution, we have to understand what is meant by 'change'. For instance, the word 'cap' is called by different names in different countries; but, there is always a cap, as referent. Change implies that there is a referent. Therefore, whenever there is a referent, there must always be the known. How can the 'known' be changed except into the 'further known'?

Question: So far as the individual is concerned, is not change modified continuity?

Krishnamurti: An individual alone can be in a continuous state of revolution, but not society. Any change in society is only a

modified continuity. Transformation must be always immediate and not left to time, i.e., to tomorrow. There is no transformation in time, but there is only modified continuity. Time cannot produce revolution or regeneration.

Is not transformation the immediate question and cannot you and I immediately transform? If we cannot, what is it that prevents immediate transformation? To be transformed in the future is a contradiction.

What prevents us from immediately transforming ourselves? We understand something now or never. Understanding is always in the Now and not in To-morrow. Why is that you and I are incapable of immediate transformation? What prevents this? Why do we not see this clearly?

Question: Is there transformation even if we see things clearly?

Krishnamurti: If I see a cobra clearly without any equivocation, do I touch it? I touch it only when I am doubtful about it being a cobra. Why have we not transformed ourselves? Transformation is creative activity. Why is it that we do not see problems that are vital as clearly as we see a poisonous snake? If we see a problem vitally and recognise its immense significance, then, we shall act properly in relation to war, nationalism, in our relationship to nature, individuals, ideas and problems of daily existence. Therefore, either we are unaware and therefore accustomed and immune to poison by constant habit, or we do not want to see.

There is no transformation except Now. I say it is possible to transform completely now and not tomorrow. Action on the basis of a belief in reincarnation is only postponement.

The real problem is why do we not transform now? Let us



understand this now.

Obviously, society is crumbling and deteriorating rapidly. Here, we are talking about change, etc. But we are not creative; we are not the architects designing a structure away from all this. To do this, we must examine the causes of the present chaos. We must be the architect, the contractor, etc., for raising this new structure. To do this, we must have complete transformation now - transformation in values, in outlook and in our whole being. I have seen this happening. Why are you not transformed? Is it because you have been so long living with the cobra that you are immune to its poison?

Question: How do you find the true cause, not mere intellectualisation, of there being no immediate transformation?

Krishnamurti: One reason is that you are immune to the poison. I recognize that immediate transformation is the only solution of all problems - not tomorrow, not reincarnation; time does not produce transformation but only brings about continuity. Transformation is essential and can take place only now. What is it that prevents that marvellous thing happening to me, from my seeing the immense significance of transforming immediately? Let us be definite about this. We cannot leave this at loose ends. We must act.

The problem is "I see the importance of transformation. Transformation can take place only now and not tomorrow. Why is there not that extraordinary drive that sees things clearly and sets about to act"?

I know instances of immediate transformation. There was a person who made an enormous amount of money by playing cards. After hearing my talks recently, that person gave up cards-playing

immediately and without any struggle.

Question: Why did not that person see this earlier?

Krishnamurti: What are the causes that prevent your seeing the obvious things that drop away? What is the element that is required to say "I see it and it is gone". One of the factors is that I must be aware I am suffering, I am in anxiety, in a state of confusion and of fear. To recognize that transformation is essential, I must not be self- contented. There must be real discontent. It must have a quality which is not mere change.

If you see a cobra and know it to be a cobra, you have an instantaneous response. There is the bodily response to the poison and you jump. It is not out of fear that you avoid the poison; but, the understanding of the nature of the poison keeps you away from the poison. Most of us are afraid. Is not fear one of the principal causes that prevent transformation? You are afraid and therefore there is no transformation.

Question: Everyone coming here wants transformation. I, for one, have no fear. Yet, there is no transformation. Why is this?

Question: Is it laziness? Is there a real desire for transformation?

Krishnamurti: Do you not know the gravity of the present structure of society, its disintegration, its ruthlessness, etc.?

Question: Yes, that is why we want to do something in the service of others.

Krishnamurti: Service of others is really a foolish idea. What prevents transformation?

Love is the only thing that transforms. You can have actual experience of this. Have you not fallen in love with some one?

Have you not been spontaneously affectionate with another?

Question: We have been affectionate to others in our house; yet, there has been no transformation?

Krishnamurti: You do not see the cobra, you do not see that you are on the edge of a precipice. Is that the trouble? Why do you not see it? Are not all writers, historians, etc., shouting that the end of the world is near? Yet, are you not enclosing yourselves in ideas like 'reincarnation', 'the Masters are looking after us', etc., and therefore are you not blind to the world and to your relationship with others? You, therefore, say "these are inevitable but everything will be alright soon or sometime later on".

Question: We see all the chaos but we feel helpless.

Krishnamurti: The confusion is so colossal that our individual acts can obviously do nothing - for instance, against the use of the atomic bomb. But, I, an individual, can create a structure away from all this confusion. We cannot persuade Truman and other big politicians to do what we think is correct; but we, though we are small people, can start somewhere else, i. e., with ourselves.

Question: Is it any use doing this in relation to the coming war, etc.?

Krishnamurti: You cannot prevent the world and the people going their own way. The same pattern can be seen in the case of all big leaders - Kaiser, Hitler, Stalin, etc. Can I persuade them by prayers or by appeals to them? No. Knowing the inevitableness of all this, I will not touch them. The simple way is for me to go my own way; I will transform myself. So far, I have also been contributing to the confusion and to the chaos in the world; now, I will withdraw.

Question: Does this not mean isolating ourselves from the world?

Krishnamurti: No. What is isolation? Are you not now isolated in your relationship with your wife, etc.? Do you know them? Is this not creating the mess in the world?

If you read any paper or magazine, you will find that, in the world, there is steady deterioration. For instance, in the business world, there is black-marketing, no morality, etc.

Question: How can all this be changed?

Krishnamurti: It is not possible to change all this. Firstly, you must see that you cannot do anything with all this. You must see that all politicians are hankering after power, etc., and that this is leading to war. Seeing this clearly, you will say "I will not hanker after power"; and that hankering will drop away. Now, why do I not do this?

I see what the politicians dabbling in power-politics are doing. I see that wherever there is search for power, there must be ruthlessness, war. I also see I am seeking power. Then, why do I not drop this domination over my wife? Power is very destructive, is very evil. Then, what is preventing one from dropping this, one's domination over one's wife, etc.?

Question: I am not conscious of this, my seeking domination over others.

Krishnamurti: By becoming aware of your attitude to your wife and to others, will you not drop it immediately and not in the next life? Either you are unaware of your seeking power or you like power; therefore, you do not want to drop it. If you like power, it vitalises you and you do not mind its effects on others. Power

ultimately leads to destruction and deteriorates the relationship between people. I like power even in my little home, and I pursue it even if it brings about chaos and destruction. I am conscious I am seeking power; I want it and I am deliberately in it; therefore, there is no problem.

Question: I want the gratification from power. If something else would give that gratification, I will follow that also.

Krishnamurti: You want power without paying for it; you had better be conscious of this without fooling about with spirituality, etc., be conscious of power and its consequences. You like power with its pleasure and with its pain; therefore, you do not want transformation. You all want to salve Mammon with God. Why not be honest and say " I want to be a leader; so, I will go after power"?

Question: Everyone is going after power. Why?

Krishnamurti: I shall show you the futility of this. Will you drop it? You have to see the futility of pursuing power. When you are seeking power, there must be ruthlessness which involves pain. When you watch this carefully, you will see it leads to war.

Question: When I see this leading to war, I drop it.

Krishnamurti: When you know that power leads to ultimate destruction, why do you not drop it? You say that "destruction may happen long after now and, in the meanwhile, what does it matter so long as I get my satisfaction for 5, 10 or 30 years?" What is that mentality which says so? That is what Napoleon and all the war-mongers did. You are also saying the same thing. How can such a mentality approach Truth - a mentality which says "I want to get this whatever it may cost"?

I cannot understand myself if I am tethered to anything - property, idea or thing. If I want to explore the South Seas, I must leave Madras. I am tethered when I say "what does it matter so long as I get what I want." At least, this is honest as I do not quote scriptures in support of what I do.

A mind that says "I want to understand Reality and I am seeking Truth" and yet is tethered, is a dishonest mind.

Thus, we discover that there cannot be transformation if there is no honest thinking. Why is my mind dishonest?

Question: I want to seek my own ends; but I cover this up by spiritual ideas, etc.

Krishnamurti: Why do you do this? Why can't you say "I want power"? One reason is 'bread and butter depends'.

Question: Why is not the mind honest at least with itself, though not in regard to others?

Krishnamurti: I am not face to face with myself. I do not know the result of my facing myself is going to be. There are so many different masks. One day I am greedy, another day I am generous and charitable, then I want to be a Viceroy, etc. Again, the Higher Self is also an invention. Which is the 'me' to which I have to be honest? I am broken up into different parts. Unless I am neurotic, I cannot say definitely "I am this". There are many contradictions in me. In a state of contradiction, I cannot be honest. I can be honest only when the contradiction in my thinking ceases. To think truly, I must get rid of contradiction. Do you know that you are in contradiction? Question: At any one instant, there is no contradiction. Contradiction arises only when I analyse the past and the present.

Krishnamurti: There is a contradiction always going on in us.

Questioner: Are we aware of our contradiction even when we are in contradiction?

Krishnamurti: Only honest direct understanding will lead to the ceasing of contradiction. To understand something, I must give my full attention to it, which is possible when there is no contradiction in me.

Question: What is contradiction?

Question: Two inconsistent desires?

Krishnamurti: Can desires be contradictory? Is not the very nature of desire contradictory? There is only one desire which takes 2 forms, one desire creating oppositions.

Am I in contradiction? I want power and I know the poison of power. I want to love but actually I hate. Are you aware of this state in your daily existence?

I now see that only very clear, honest thinking can bring about immediate transformation. One of the factors preventing this is this life of contradiction. We are in contradiction, for instance, when we want to go somewhere else and yet we want to stay here. In that state, choice exists; and so, as long as choice exists, there must be conflict.

Choice exists because you are confused. There is no choice when you see a thing clearly. Contradiction is when I do not see clearly, when choice comes into action. When I see clearly what I want to do, there is no choice and no contradiction.

So, as long as I am choosing, there is contradiction and there is dishonesty in thinking. Do you agree to that? Your whole life is based on choice - between the Real and the Unreal, between Good

and Evil etc.; and therefore, there is contradiction.

Question: Are we not always in daily life, if we are intelligent, making a choice? Krishnamurti: You make a choice only when you do not know what to do. For factual things, you must choose. But, choice in psychological things is when you are confused. You do not choose between pleasure and pain but you pursue pleasure. A mind which is confused and choosing is a dishonest mind, i.e., doing a thing not knowing what it is doing.

Question: Dishonesty implies a standard of morality.

Krishnamurti: No. Choice exists only in matters that are irrelevant or are not clearly seen. Clear perception is honest thinking. As long as there is choice, there is confusion. Do you ever psychologically choose?

Question: Yes; when I want to earn money or when I renounce something.

Krishnamurti: No. You are seeking pleasure whether it comes through earning money or renouncing something. Therefore, there is no choice, psychologically.

I do not see clearly because I am choosing. Psychologically, I pursue pleasure. As long as I am pursuing pleasure and using wrong words, I am deceiving myself - for instance, by saying "I serve the world," "I serve the poor" etc. All this is based on pleasure. I must not deceive myself in any way. I must be very clear in my feelings, thoughts and actions. Then only there can be immediate transformation.

Do you not get what you want if that desire is not lukewarm? You envy Napoleons and Stalins who went ruthlessly and wholeheartedly after what they wanted. Spiritual leaders also have



acted likewise, though with kid gloves.

Dishonesty is lack of perception, avoidance of looking at things as they are.

We have now come to this point: Transformation is not a matter of words or explanations; it comes instantaneously when we see things clearly.

When one gives up property or good income, how does one do it? Have you given up anything instantaneously?

Question: I dropped 'belief' and 'authority' after I heard your talk on 'fear', at No. 14, Sterling Road.

Krishnamurti: Why do you want to give up something, for getting rid of fear or on seeing it as it is? You dropped because you were face to face with the problem and there was no retreat. You get rid of authority when you face the thing directly. When you face it, you see the crooked action and it drops away.

Why is it that you do not drop all that divides, conditioned thinking? Because you do not see that it is poisonous and because you do not give your full attention to it, you tend to slur over it. Take war, for instance. You know all the causes, the opposites of ideologies. Yet, you all play with war. If you give your complete attention to war, you will not play with war. There is no transformation now because your attention is not given; you think you have too many commitments and by such thinking you deceive yourselves.

If we focused our attention on one thing and completely understood it, our mind is unburdened and is capable of looking at things directly; we would then understand anything psychological, and there would be instantaneous transformation now.

When we do not read the label clearly, we drink the poison and suffer the consequences. We can read the label only when we are attentive. One of our difficulties is we like to be lazy and we are inattentive in regard to things that do matter.

Question: Can we help it?

Krishnamurti: If I offer you something, will you take it? Take, for instance, a doctor. Will it be enough if he merely put up a signboard? Must there not be a patient? There must be a patient and also a doctor; otherwise, the profession ceases. If I am a patient, I will not leave the doctor till I am well. Is not that relationship essential?

Question: The disease may be incurable.

Question: Even then, you go to the doctor. How can you suppose you are incurable before you consult a doctor?

Krishnamurti: Between the doctor and the patient, there must be mutual affection, not respect; so also between you and me. When you love somebody, then there is open receptivity, communion between both; there is understanding. This affection is not because he is going to cure me nor because I want to be cured. Because there is no affection wherever we are which means love, there is no immediate transformation. It is that element which is missing in all of us. Therefore, there is no real communication between us, but only verbal. We are on the edge of things and not in the centre. When there is love, there are no sentiments and no emotions.

Question: Apparently, we do not know love then.

Krishnamurti: You are going to know it. There is no flame without smoke.

April 11, 1948

## **MADRAS 2ND GROUP DISCUSSION 13TH APRIL, 1948**

We were talking about the importance of immediate transformation and about the things that prevent us from radical regeneration. We were discussing the importance of the individual and his relationship with the world; how when there is a contradiction, there cannot be honest thinking; and how real understanding brings about transformation; and also, that love is not sentiment or emotion.

We must find out for ourselves the truth about the individual and his relation to the world, how the transformation of the individual immediately affects the world in which he lives. The world we live in is the world of our immediate relationship with our family, our boss, our cook etc., and not with a geographical world. If you can transform intrinsically, then there is sure to be an immediate transformation, not superficially but deeply, in the relationship in your world. Will not this effect produce a revolution in your relationship? Is it not important to understand the necessity of individual transformation which will affect the world in which you live? Is that not a practical way of affecting the world you live in?

In confronting the war with its miseries, the limitations imposed by national frontiers, the economic confusion, the vast complexity, we feel frustrated with the enormity of the problem; but that frustration is a false response. You are not called upon to deal with the problems of America and Europe. Your talk about all this is mere gossip. You may rebel against atom bombs etc., you can talk

gossip about it and about what others say about it. But, you cannot do anything about atom bombs. You and I cannot do anything about them. They are not our problems. But, you and I can do directly something in the world in which we live, by transforming ourselves.

So the individual transformation is the only solution for this chaos. Individual transformation alone will lead to other individuals transforming themselves and this will bring about a revolution in thought and therefore in action. This means you will be free of all organizations, systems, beliefs. You cannot rely on these absurdities, as you know it to be futile and empty. If this is clear we can proceed further. Do you see the truth of it? There can be transformation in the world only when there is regeneration of the individual. Mass action is therefore fallacious. The crowd, the mob, is invented by the politician. There is mass psychology which is used by clever people, but there is no such thing as the mass.

Question: There seems to be a general idea that unless the mass changes, there is no use of any individual working.

Krishnamurti: Are you caught up in the idea that individual action is without meaning unless there is a mass action? Mere belief is sluggishness indulged in in a hot climate. Is mass action the only action? Is there the mass, the crowd? Groups can be influenced, infuriated to act - Hindus to kill all Muslims and Muslims to kill all Hindus. Mass is composed of individuals and individuals can be persuaded, regimented to accept nationalism and to kill others. The action of the mass is thus influenced. If you begin to think, to be aware, to question, you cease to be the mass. When you do not accept authority, tradition, belief, then you

become an individual; otherwise, you are one of a conglomeration of people driven. If it is so, then all our actions must correspondingly change. It is a fallacy to think that there can be no radical transformation in the world unless there is mass action. Label is the mass. The mass may be killed but it is difficult to kill an individual. When you look at another individual as an individual and not as a mass, your action is different; this means a radical revolution in your ways of thinking. You are an individual seeking the truth for itself and therefore you are inviting an infinite lot of trouble. If you really have an inward revolution, your ways of behaviour to your family and to others will be transformed.

We discussed whether contradiction can lead to honesty of thought. There can be immediate transformation only when there is clear, honest perception of the problems. Is not our living in contradiction one of our difficulties - opposing desires, opposing demands? Therefore, we never see the problem as it is and we give it a different interpretation from what it is.

Why do we live in contradiction? Are we aware we live in contradiction? We talk about peace and anything we do is towards war. We talk about brotherhood and we have castes, classes and titles. We want physical security and we do everything to destroy that security. We stand for unity and brotherhood yet we are exclusive in various ways.

Question: What is it that destroys security?

Krishnamurti: Nationalism destroys physical security. It brings about war. Everything we do psychologically is against peace.

Question: When we jump out of our state of contradiction, will there be honest thinking? Or, must we isolate ourselves?

Krishnamurti: Are you aware that you are in contradiction? You cannot call yourself a nationalist and at the same time talk of peace. When property is used for self-expansion, it leads to hatred. It is a contradiction. When you have particular beliefs, can you maintain real brotherhood?

Question: Please expand the ideas about property?

Krishnamurti: I need a little property. It is not a pursuit of exclusion. But the psychological expansion through property leads to hatred.

Question: I may not, but another may seek self-expansion. What to do then? Krishnamurti: Then you will not cause hatred. You will start a new culture. If you really enquire into the causes why there is no immediate transformation, then you will see.

Question: Where is contradiction in seeking self-expansion through property?

Krishnamurti: As I said, seeking security through property leads to hatred and therefore there will be no peace. As we live in contradiction in different ways, through organizations, through rituals etc., we do everything to destroy affection. If that is so, we must first be aware of it and put an end to contradiction. We cannot jump out of it, it is not a net. We must become conscious of our thoughts and actions and become intelligent about every one of our activities. This is really difficult in a hot climate, where there are many things preventing clear, honest thinking. If you want to think clearly, you must have sufficient food but no indulgence. Contradiction has a great deal to do with immediate transformation. This means that we must focus our attention on everything we do. This is very difficult. We eat food placed before

us on a feast-day, without thinking. This has direct relationship with our daily life. You must have a clear swift mind to follow this clearly. You cannot indulge as you like. Contradiction is one of the hindrances to transformation as it will not allow any moment of full attention on something directly.

See what happens when we are voluntarily or spontaneously giving our attention to something, without seeking a result - examining a human problem. The mind is then in an extraordinary state, passive, pliable and capable of seeing clearly. Such a state is not possible when there is contradiction. You know for yourself inwardly when you are not living in a state of contradiction, when you are in a state of integration.

Why is there this contradiction? Is it not because you have never thought about a problem completely to the end? If you have really thought out a belief, then there will be no contradiction about your analysis of the problem. You will then be so swift in perception that you will see clearly.

Question: Has this not something to do with capacity?

Krishnamurti: No. Only a few have capacity; capacity is a gift. You want to know if we can do this even when we have not got any special capacity. Have we not got intelligence to understand? When we want something, we go after it. Now, you want to live in a state in which there is no contradiction. If you really see that a mind in contradiction cannot see honestly, then you pursue every talk alertly and see where the contradiction lies and so on, till there is no contradiction. You can either shut your eyes to your state of contradiction or you can be aware of the contradiction that exists. If you are aware, you go after every contradiction. You cannot do

away with contradiction unless you are healthy physically, and you must become intelligent about everything you do. This has nothing to do with capacity.

Question: Some are more aware and others less aware.

Krishnamurti: Why compare yourself with others? You are this and why should you become that? To watch yourself from moment to moment, your thoughts and your feelings, does it mean capacity? Please try for yourself and experiment.

Question: I want to try and therefore I want to get that capacity.

Krishnamurti: Your desire for capacity is preventing experimentation. I am not interested in capacity.

Question: How to try to be aware from moment to moment?

Krishnamurti: Try to be conscious of, to know and to understand what you are doing. You want to know what to do to try.

Audience: He must wake up.

Audience: I feel I am aware of what I am doing.

Krishnamurti: Are you? Are you aware of the contradiction? You go after a thing when you take interest in it. Do you understand your doing pooja, do you find the whole meaning of it, i.e., whether you do it on authority or because your family likes it or because it gives you sensation or a self-hypnosis or an emotional kick? This finding of the whole meaning of what you do, is what is meant by being aware.

Question: The fundamental urge is to seek happiness. As long as it gives me satisfaction, is it not happiness?

Krishnamurti: Then, what is your problem? Is it for satisfaction to continue? You can take a drink and be blind to the world, and



you can think you are happy. But, the morning after the drink, you pay for it. You cannot maintain the immediate pleasure always.

It is not a question of capacity or gift. On the contrary, we can all do this. Only we must take interest in it, experiment with it and go at it seriously. Asking for a way, etc., is just postponement. A contradictory mind cannot have honest thought. You must have honest direct thinking to bring about transformation.

A simple man does not live in a state of contradiction. Simplicity of heart and mind is the thing to transform you from moment to moment. We are all simple outwardly but complicated inwardly. Simplicity must begin at the psychological and not at the outward end.

Question: When we see the contradiction, we are lost in positive or negative thinking.

Krishnamurti: When you see the contradiction you will not be lost. You go into the problem, look at it and then see what is.

Question: I am not aware of any contradiction.

Krishnamurti: That is it. You can be aware of contradictions only when you are alert; then only you can go into the contradictions.

Question: I don't see any contradiction but I pursue what I like.

Krishnamurti: If you do not see any contradiction, it does not mean that there is no contradiction. You can know for yourself whether you are in a state of contradiction or not. If there is no contradiction, your mind will be still, quiet. Apparently your mind is not quiet, but restless. To know you, I must look at you and focus my attention on you without being distracted. There is no exclusiveness in awareness.

Question: I don't understand you.

Krishnamurti: I don't want to go into it now. Attention is not exclusive. If I exclude, there is effort and effort leads to distortion. Awareness is not effort. When you go out for a walk what happens? You are receiving all the impressions, about birds, people, cars, etc., if you are alert and if you are not immersed in a problem. You can give your attention to any one of these things and yet be receptive to the other impressions also. The mind, if not drugged by a problem, is receiving impressions; in that state of receptivity, one object, out of all the many, can be looked at more closely.

If I have a problem and concentrate on it through effort, it is exclusive. Through exclusion, I cannot understand it. Through exclusion, I miss something which may help me to understand it. I must come to the problem without a sense of exclusion; which means, I must be open all round to any impression with regard to that problem, to every movement of thought. When I examine any one part, I am not excluding anything else but I am sensitive to everything that may arise. For instance, I must listen to you and at the same time be alert to listen to what anyone else says and then find out the truth in everything that is said.

Question: I am beginning to understand you. If all of us talk simultaneously can you listen?

Krishnamurti: It is no possible even to hear clearly and listen to anyone if several of you talk at the same time. To be aware is to be open. Therefore, awareness is not a practice, it is not a habit. The moment I create a habit, it is exclusion. To be aware of my contradiction is not to have a screen between me and my

contradiction, the screen of conclusion or answer. If I want to understand you, I must have no screen of prejudice between you and me. When I am aware of the screen, the screen is removed. I am open to find out in what way I am living in contradiction, which is different from not being in a state of contradiction. I am then inviting all the contradictions, including all those in the hidden layers of consciousness. Question: This means we must not approach a problem with a preconceived conception.

Krishnamurti: Yes. It is difficult. You must free the mind from all conclusions. For this, we must be aware of the existence of conclusions. I am not open to you if I have prejudice against you. If I understand the prejudice and let it go away, then I am open. The problem will cease when the prejudices are removed.

I have now discovered that a contradictory mind has no capacity to look directly, and it is a dishonest mind. To understand contradiction, I must be aware of the contradictions without any exclusion. Exclusion prevents understanding; therefore, concentration which is exclusion prevents understanding. All our attempts are made to concentrate. All this has got to be undone.

Question: When you approach a problem without a screen, you say there is no problem. What does this mean? What is meant by justification and condemnation?

Krishnamurti: Take any psychological problem. You always quote and get the screen between you and the problem. If the screen is removed, you see the problem clearly.

Individual transformation brings about immediate revolution in the world in which we live. Individual revolution is of the highest importance and not mass revolution. The mass is only an invention

of the capitalists and others; it does not exist.

Question: If I am happy, how can the people who are here share it?

Krishnamurti: If there is a smile, even an ignorant man responds. It is our conception that an ignorant man cannot be happy. When there is exclusion, there is no understanding. Only when there is passive alertness there is openness. A primary factor that brings about revolution, is love. Love is not sentiment, not emotion.

It is sufficient if you are aware even momentarily. When you are aware you see great wisdom; then there is an interval and in that interval there is relaxation and it will be revealing.

April 13, 1948

## **MADRAS 3RD GROUP DISCUSSION 16TH APRIL, 1948**

We were discussing why it is not possible to bring about immediate transformation. In discussing it, the importance of the individual to society was clear enough. The modern tendency in the world's affairs is to neglect the individual and to think of the mass. If you examine the matter closely without any system or prejudice, you will find that the individual is the only entity and not the mass. The mass as such is a myth, though there is mass psychology. There is no honesty of thought where there is contradiction. Contradiction is a negation. Where there is negation there is no thought at all. When a man is in contradiction, though he thinks in a series of positive actions, his action is merely a negation. To bring about immediate transformation, there must be honesty of thought. Honesty of thought is not possible, if there is contradiction.

Also, awareness is not concentration. Where there is concentration, there is no understanding but only exclusion.

What is it that brings about a fundamental transformation?

Transformation is not in the net of time. It is in the immediate and not in postponement. What is it that brings about a revolution of thought, not of ideas or opinions? Ideas and opinions create further ideas and opinions and therefore conflict. Do ideas bring about transformation? They may bring about a change or a modification of continuity. Do they bring about a fundamental revolution in man? If our minds are clouded, not clear, with regard to the means, the instruments of transformation, we cannot come to

those things which really bring about transformation.

Will ideas bring about an inward revolution? Mere outward change, however, social or utilitarian, is of little use. It is always the inner which overcomes the outer; the psychological motives, etc., alter the outward. What do we mean by ideas? Can the process of thought bring about transformation? Thought produces the idea. Can thought bring about transformation? You should see the importance of transformation. Transformation is necessary now because the whole structure of society is going to pieces. As it is essential to transform and as it is possible to transform immediately, what is it that will make us transform? Essentially, there must be honesty of thought; one must be honest to oneself. One knows clearly when one is off the beam of honesty. To know directly for oneself what one is thinking, this honesty is necessary.

Question: Could we get clear ideas as to what thinking is? By thinking, do you mean reaching a conclusion? Is there any moment when the mind which is not leading to a conclusion, can be said to be thinking? Thought is a state in which one is transformed as clear thinking is possible only when we are not in contradiction.

Krishnamurti: Where there is contradiction, there is no thought. What is the process of thinking?

Audience: (1) Sifting of an evidence to reach a conclusion.

Audience: (2) Not necessarily.

Audience: (3) Thinking implies setting in motion the contents of the mind, preconceived notions etc.

Audience: (4) Process of correlation is thinking.

Krishnamurti: You say that thinking is a movement of various conclusions and memories, this putting in motion being due to a

new challenge. Response is the movement of the mind in response to a challenge.

Question: Thinking is response to challenge. This is a vague statement. If somebody misbehaves towards me, I slap him. This is my response; but this is not thinking.

Krishnamurti: Process of discovering and experiencing as in Science- experiments, is it thinking? There is thinking only when there is a desire for a conclusion, for a solution, a remedy, an overcoming, a discipline. If there is experiencing and discovery, is it thinking?

Question: In experiencing, this kind of correlated thinking stops.

Krishnamurti: We investigate to find a solution for a cause, analysing, dissecting, examining, probing, thinking out logically from different sides etc., till we find a solution; this, we call thinking. Does this come into being when we are experiencing? Experience may be termed, recorded and kept in the memory.

Thinking exists when there is investigation, enquiry and reaching a conclusion, - that is a way of finding a solution and answer. I think about something, I recollect. This is a process of association, investigation and finding out. Thinking out is always trying to find an answer. In that process of thinking I rely on my memory, factual as well as psychological. The response of memory in the process of enquiry, I call thinking. I have a problem. How do I think about it? I think about it in terms of memory or conclusion. Thinking starts with a response of memory towards a conclusion, an answer, searching out an issue.

Factual memory is the memory of technique, of facts.

Psychological memory is the memory of self-expansive continuity - me, mine, my house, my family - the accumulating factor, gathering, sustaining itself. We discussed this previously. The me, the I, the whole inward existence is memory. Without memory there would be no continuity to 'the me' from day to day.

Thinking is the outcome of a series of conclusions, memories which we have stored up. When I think about a person, the thought is a conclusion or a picture of that person. Therefore, thinking is a series of responses of memory; it is always in the field of the conditioning. Thus, you have the three things: thinking, experiencing and discovery. Thinking we know now.

Question: Thinking is response of memory. Cannot a conclusion be new?

Krishnamurti: I am not sure it is. Thought is the product of conclusions, memories.

Question: Darwin's thinking led to the discovery of the theory of evolution.

Krishnamurti: How does a new theory come into being? Is it the result of thought, which is a conclusion of previous thoughts?

Question: In Science, you can only arrive at truth of things by thinking.

Krishnamurti: Do you? Do you not think up to a certain point and then you suddenly jump? Does that jumping-state come because of the thinking? What we are discussing is practical. Is thought essential to that state, when the new is perceived? Is a process of conclusions and their responses necessary before there is a jump into the new? Is the old the spring-board to the new?

Question: Unless the mind has moved through the labyrinth of



the old, we cannot see the new.

Krishnamurti: When do you see a new clarity, a new meaning? Is it after serious thinking and as a result of such thinking? When does the new take place? I have thought about a problem within the field of conclusions, and I cannot solve it. Suddenly the flash comes when the mind ceases to worry. Would it not come if I had not worried?

Question: If I have a conclusion not in the field of the known, the shifting to a different field is automatic. Is it ever possible to leave alone thought, till we are sure that there is nothing to be found?

Question: (2) Is the process of thought essential for discovery? Would you say that a conclusion is not a discovery? Is it possible to reach a new conclusion without thinking?

Krishnamurti: I have a problem and I search for the solution in the field of the known. I investigate into the field of the known and then when my mind is exhausted, I drop it. You say that it is necessary to exhaust the known before the new is perceived.

Question: There can be application only of known facts in Science.

Krishnamurti: The Scientist is dealing with the known and not the unknown. If there is a problem which cannot be dealt with in the field of conclusions, what do you do? Must we go to the field of formulas, conclusions and then get exhausted before we see the new? We understand a problem within the field of conclusions. It is simple. When the mind exhausts itself in the field of conclusions, it has dropped the problem; and then, the new comes in suddenly. You say that the new cannot come in without the

previous state of investigation. Actually, you worry and worry; and suddenly you may get the new solution. You say that there must be previous investigation and examination of all the relevant facts before the new comes in.

Question: A haphazard mind can never get anything new.

Question: (2) What is a new conclusion?

Krishnamurti: It is not really new but only a new view of the old. Do you not suddenly see something which is not a new arrangement or a new view of the old, but something entirely new?

Which is true? A genius may learn a technique. All great artists and geniuses have a vision. They may learn a technique or develop their own technique. Does technique lead to genius?

Question: Does effort lead to spontaneity?

Krishnamurti: Effort can never lead to spontaneity. I have a problem which cannot be answered by merely readjusting an old answer, but which requires a completely new answer. We see that a mind that is seeking a conclusion for a problem gets a conclusion and goes on creating further problems. A mind which is still and is therefore open to the new does not need to go through these stages. We are caught either in conclusion or in readjustment of old values, and therefore we are unobservant of the new.

The mind is still when it does not want a conclusion, when it is not seeking an answer. Does that stillness come into being through cultivation?

Question: Supposing a man has no factual memory. Can he discover?

Krishnamurti: If a man has no factual memory at all, he is not there. Is cultivation, processes of thinking, necessary for stillness?

Can thought-process - investigating, re- sponses of conclusions, - give place to stillness? Stillness comes only when the thought-process comes to an end. The new is seen only when the mind is still.

Question: Absence of thought-process is not necessary for stillness. There can be intelligent activity of mind which is not thinking - for instance, enquiring.

Krishnamurti: Stillness is not the stillness of death. It is passive alertness.

Question: When we are discussing, are we not thinking?

Krishnamurti: In discussing, we have discarded conclusions and adjustment of values. We went through removing the old misconceptions. The process of thinking comes in verbalization.

Question: The process of enquiry, discarding of ideas, is not this a hindrance to stillness?

Krishnamurti: The stillness gives a new answer. For this, thinking is not necessary. We never thought about anything when we discovered that stillness is necessary. Actually, there is no process, we just see it. When once we see the necessity of stillness, we need not go through the thought-process.

Question: Is not having a problem a process of thinking?

Krishnamurti: Silence is when the thinker, the creator of the problem, ceases to think. We do not see things as they are, if we think in the field of the known. I discover and therefore experience. Where thought-process exists, there, there cannot be experiencing, discovery. Discovery takes place only when the thought-process ceases. When I see the necessity of silence, I do not need to cultivate silence. The moment we see that silence is essential, we

are silent.

Question: Intention to find the truth and the discovery of the truth can come only when there is silence. Do these not form a process?

Krishnamurti: Intention is to discover. There is only a verbal process. I see the importance of silence. Is it a verbal process or an inward process? Question: Is not the thinking process a verbal process?

Krishnamurti: Please investigate your own minds. What were you doing? Were you looking, investigating etc., or were you merely waiting? You did not start with a conclusion, nor were you seeking any conclusion.

Question: Is not a discussion necessary for silence?

Krishnamurti: I put a question to you. Are you thinking it out?

Question: Discussion is a movement of the mind, positive or negative.

Krishnamurti: Whether positive or negative, mind is thinking. Are we merely rationalizing? Seeing things directly, is it not different from thought-process. You saw the importance of silence and then you talk or verbalize about it. Through verbalizing you do not see. Thought- process begins only in communications with another, or in recording, or in experiencing. Thought-process is not necessary for experiencing. Experiencing is not a state of thinking.

Question: You tell us something. We are experiencing it in the light of our memories and then we accept it. Is it not thinking?

Krishnamurti: Does thinking lead you to discovery? The state of creative being does not come through technique. Thought-process does not produce transformation. You can jump into discovery.

Question: Is not thought-process a hindrance to transformation?

Krishnamurti: Certainly. If thought-process is not the catalyst what else is it? I can say this only when I know this for myself.

Question: Learning and studying, is it thinking process or something different?

Krishnamurti: Is there any thinking process in looking at facts? Thinking is in relating, modifying memory. Is learning necessary for this silence? Obviously not. When one is really seeking, there is no thought-process. For instance, we have not thought, but we have only communicated. Thought did not discover. The thought ceased and we discovered. The mind is the most extraordinary instrument we have; for instance, it deals with supersonic waves, curvature-space, etc., but, we do not know how to use this wonderful instrument.

If you look at a problem properly, you can discover the new always. To discover the new, thought-process is not necessary at all; on the other hand, thought-process is a positive hindrance to discovery.

April 16, 1948

## **MADRAS 4TH GROUP DISCUSSION 18TH APRIL, 1948**

We have been discussing the importance of and the need for the inner transformation of the individual; when the individual transforms himself, there is a possibility of a revolution in the world to which he is in immediate relationship. Contradiction impedes the individual's thinking as it is a negation of thinking; contradiction is not only the superficial contradiction in every-day-existence but also the contradictions of the deeper layers of consciousness. Unless the individual unearths all these contradictions and eradicates them through awareness, there is no possibility of transformation. We also saw the possibility of the thought-process leading to the solution of a human problem. Every such problem is created by the thinker, and thought also is a product of the thinker. Therefore, thought-process cannot solve the problem. Transformation must be only in the Now and any postponement is not conducive to transformation, as such postponement is really avoidance of action

What then will bring about the immediate transformation of the individual? What is it that is going to bring about an inner revolution, an immediate change in values and directions? Will emotion, feeling, bring about this transformation?

What do you mean by emotion? Is emotion love; is sentiment, feeling, related to love? What is the necessary impetus to bring about a revolution leading to individual action? Ideas breed ideas and may bring about superficial revolution; but, they do not lead to inner revolution. Yet the world is engaged in building up ideas,

patterns of action, etc. Since ideas cannot bring about that inward regeneration, what is it that would bring it about? Does emotion or feeling, however vital, bring about this revolution?

Is there a difference between thought and emotion? Is not emotion the same as thought? You can't think about love, but you can think about emotions or about the object of love, desire, sensation and feeling. Is that feeling love? This is important because through a process of understanding you will come to that which will lead to immediate transformation. Since thought is not the medium of transformation, will strong emotions bring about the same?

Question: (1) Is not emotion a feeling of pleasure and pain in experiencing, as a response to a challenge? Is not emotion a sense of fervour? If there is no fervour, there is no possibility of alteration.

Krishnamurti: How do you get fervour? Through ideation?

Question: (2) I want to know if fervour is emotion.

Krishnamurti: What is emotion?

Audience: Emotions are the projections of one's perceptions in the mind, which quicken the sense from within.

Question: (3) When I am angry, is it not emotion?

Krishnamurti: Let us discover it together by going into it slowly and deeply. When do you have emotions?

Question: From the mind, from external stimulants. Do we get this instantaneously?

Krishnamurti: When do you feel emotions? Question: When you know that some person causes you pleasure or pain?

Krishnamurti: When you see a glorious sunset, is there an

emotion? You are only in a state of experiencing. It is only after that state when you record or when you communicate that experience to yourself or to another, you verbalise it. Look at a tree. When you come upon it afresh, what takes place? When do you say "I am feeling, I have strong sentiment"? Is not one part of it due to communication?

Question: When you see a beggar, you may or may not feel an emotion.

Krishnamurti: If that person is dull, he will not feel. When do you feel an emotion?

Question: When you see a cobra and have a feeling of fear, there is no communication.

Krishnamurti: Communication is one part of emotion. When I tell you I love you, I have an emotion. In communicating, that emotion becomes strengthened. When is it that we feel emotion?

Question: When you see a cobra, the mind comes into action and also the process of memory. Then there is emotion of fear.

Krishnamurti: I want to discover it. I should not make a definite statement.

Question: Can you ever predict when you are having emotions?

Krishnamurti: Have you ever had any emotions?

Question: Yes, when I have disturbance of some sort or other.

Krishnamurti: Are emotions the instruments of transformation? When do you feel emotion? You said, that, through external or inward stimulants, you get a feeling and by terming it you give it a permanency and strengthen it. By not terming it you diminish it. That emotion or feeling cannot bring about revolution. Will stimuli provide the necessary impetus? Will intensity of emotion



transform? You say that great grief can transform an individual, or an ecstasy can. Can they bring about a sustained revolution of values? Can sorrow be the instrument of transformation? Can sorrow beget intelligence? We know that the shock of sorrow cannot bring about intelligence.

Question: Intense feeling is not conducive to intelligence.

Krishnamurti: You have not said what you mean by emotion.

Question: Emotion is unreason, instinctive impulse.

Krishnamurti: Can't you find out when you have an emotion and then start from there?

Question: Emotion comes into being when you are empty.

Krishnamurti: Is that so? My son dies. I have a strong emotion. Will that sorrow of loneliness, breaking of habit, bring about a revolution of values? Emotions, feelings of pleasure or pain, are first nervous responses, and then psychological responses - that is, responses of memory. Will grief modify your character? Will the shock of my son's death change my character?

Question: Has not grief a chastening effect on the soul?

Krishnamurti: Is grief a means of betterment of character, of the soul, of your being?

Question: (2) Great grief can make a man a scoundrel also.

Krishnamurti: Grief has no effect on character; but, the thought about grief has. My son dies and I think about it. It is my attitude towards that grief that makes a change in me. I go to a temple, I give up some old habits and seek an escape. This is not a real change or revolution. So, you must become aware that you are escaping; then only you will be in direct relationship and you will discover your state of being. Facing the actual state without

seeking any escape from it leads to inner revolution. Devotion, various forms of emotion, sentimentality may modify the superficial structure of one's being but they cannot bring about transformation which is a complete alteration in direction. Why is it then that there is no transformation?

Question: The desire to escape, which is an impediment.

Krishnamurti: Yes, it is one factor. Dishonesty is another factor. Thought as a means to transformation is another. The idea of 'becoming', evolution, the giving of the time-interval is another. Transformation is a complete rebirth. It is not as a result of calculation. Have you not felt it when you have given up something? Why are we not creative? You have to discover for yourself what stands in the way of transformation. Thought-process is not conducive to transformation.

Emotions, devotion, ecstasy, sentiment may bring about some change, but that change is not transformation.

Is love emotion or sentiment? Can you think about love? You can think about emotions and therefore emotions are in the field of thought, such as, good and bad, worthy and unworthy emotions. Emotions are feelings, are names given by thought. I can think about objects of love but I cannot think about the state which I call love. I can think about the emotions. We may call these emotions love, though incorrectly. Emotions may be good or evil and they are only a different aspect of thought.

Question: Love is not born of thought-process.

Krishnamurti: You are right.

Question: Thought is a weighing or re-arrangement. Are not emotions similar?

Krishnamurti: I see you and I say "I am glad". The naming of the feeling comes when I want to communicate with you or to establish within myself what I felt. When there is a feeling, the naming of that feeling is the thought-process. Thought arises also from stimuli. Thought is a response of memory and memory is a record in which the names, terms, incomplete experiences, the result of stimuli, exist. Feeling is also the result of stimuli. So, what is the difference between thought and feeling? Question:

Verbalised response of memory is thinking and feeling is the state before verbalising, before giving it a name; it is also a response.

Krishnamurti: What is the difference between feeling and thinking? Is it not a device of the mind to separate these two so that it may deal with them? The feeling-process is perception, contact, sensation, desire and naming. We have already seen that there is no thinker without thought, there is no feeling without the feeler. Is there any difference between feeling and thinking?

Question: Emotions exist when there is lack of understanding.

Question: If somebody hits me, I understand it and I am angry with the hitter.

Krishnamurti: We want to find out if thought is not emotion.

Question: Is there not a difference between feeling and sensation? We touch a watch. The sensation is not feeling.

Krishnamurti: When you think about a person, you have a sensation which is another form of feeling. You lay so much emphasis on devotion. Is not devotion the same as the thought-process?

Question: Whenever we are either attracted or repulsed, there is thought and sensation.

Krishnamurti: Yes. Similarly in emotion, there is attraction and repulsion.

Question: Devotion has transformed some people.

Krishnamurti: We cannot discuss third persons. There might be other persons or he may have only changed and not transformed. Let us discuss ourselves. You have devotion for your guru, for your ideal. Has it transformed you?

Question: (1) Such a devotion is an impediment.

Krishnamurti: Obviously. So also emotions or devotion are impediments. Question: Devotion is a response to memory.

Krishnamurti: It is still within the field of memory. If thought-process is an impediment, then sentimentality (to feel soft, to have a sense of warmth) - called noble devotion, etc., - is also an impediment because it is all in the field of thought. If you see the truth of this, there is freedom from this; and that freedom itself is enough. You will not use emotions, devotion, as a means of transformation.

Question: That is, you have to get rid of the attitude.

Krishnamurti: Yes, for instance, in thinking that you do something in the service of mankind. Instead of saying in the service of mankind, please do what you want, simply. Can you ever live without emotions?

Question: I see the possibility of it.

Krishnamurti: I recognize that understanding comes only when thought-process ceases. Similarly, emotion is another form of thought-process. Do you agree? The difficulty lies in your thinking that they are different. You say there is self-surrender in your devotion to God. Is there self-surrender? You say that is your aim

and that you will surrender to God at a future date; and you call this desire devotion.

Question: Devotion is only the means to self-surrender.

Krishnamurti: You say that you cannot surrender wholly now but that you will begin now, and that devotion is the process of your surrendering, giving yourself over, gradually to God.

Question: We would like to be transformed but we know nothing about transformation. Nothing that we know, leads to transformation. My capacity to renounce is less than my conception of it. Therefore, that which I can effortlessly renounce is called devotion. It is a tribute of incapacity to a possibility.

Krishnamurti: The main point is whether devotion is a transforming factor, not eventually, but now. It is silly to think of giving oneself over to God eventually. You would like it but you do not do it. You say you are incapable. Why incapable? You give yourself over to something if you are vitally interested in it.

Question: At its very best, devotion is a recognition of blindness.

Krishnamurti: It is a movement in the direction of self-denial. By action, by gesture, you will find out.

Question: (1) When there is devotion, you postulate another entity called God.

Krishnamurti: If you have devotion, why do you not surrender completely now?

Question: Because we are not honest.

Krishnamurti: Why are you not honest? You must find out the whole substance of this. If you realize that it is only now there can be transformation and that transformation is essential for happiness

and for a new structure in society, you have to find out why there is no immediate transformation, what the impediments are. If thought prevents understanding, then emotion will also prevent it, devotion, ecstasy, joy. We must go outside the field of all this.

Question: I am a lover of music, and I derive joy from it. Is that emotion?

Krishnamurti: If music becomes an addiction, it is an impediment. You hear music and you have joy. Then you name that joy and want a repetition of it. Then that joy is emotion and is brought into the field of thought. It therefore ceases to be joy but only memory. Therefore, it is an impediment. When music is an escape from daily routine, it is not a joy but a night-mare. There is joy when there is constant freshness and not when you take joy into memory and bring it into the field of thought. An emotion untermmed is not the same as when it is termed, brought into the field of thought and used as a means for one's continuing or for something else. So long as you think about a feeling, it is thought. Devotion as a means for self-abandonment is a thought-process. There is no devotion without thought-process, and therefore they are both impediments to transformation. A feeling, an emotion, when thought about, ceases to be feeling. Is there a state of being which is not within the field of thought-process? Anything within the field of thought is the known. To know the unknown I must completely abandon the known. Therefore, devotion, feeling, emotion - all of which lie in the field of thought, the known - are impediments to transformation.

At the moment of experiencing there is neither the experiencer nor the experience. At the moment of experiencing there is no

recording. The recorder then says that he had an experience and names it.

Is there a state which is not in the field of thought, something beyond the thought-process? I can only find this out when the thought-process ceases. We see now the importance of the ceasing of the thought-process, of feeling. You have experienced that it is possible to have a complete cessation of thought, no matter even if it was for a split second, when you are not thinking; but your mind is alert and passive; your mind is not active because it has understood that thought is an impediment. When the thought-process is not functioning, you and I are completely open to each other and there is no barrier. It is only when we love each other that there can be complete openness between us.

Why is this not your experience? We see the possibility of being completely open and this state of openness is only when there is love. Therefore, love is not emotion. It is a state when the mind is extraordinarily alert; but you cannot capture it, you cannot think about it. You should perceive the activities of thought. When you are aware of the thought-process, the thought-process will cease to function and the mind will be completely quiet and open and then it will be able to discover what is beyond the thought-process.

April 18, 1948

## **MADRAS 5TH GROUP DISCUSSION 20TH APRIL, 1948**

We have discussed the importance of immediate transformation and how it can be brought about; also how individual regeneration is not a process of time but free of time and it is not "becoming". We saw the various forms of hindrances that introduce the time-element. It is possible to see a thing directly, clearly and honestly. It is only when there is a contradiction that the time-element comes in. The time-element is introduced whenever we allow the thought-process to take place. Emotions, sentimentality and devotion are within the field of time, of thought; therefore, they and the various forms of feeling are not love. One cannot think about love but only about objects of love thereby having sensations and deriving stimulation, emotions; thus, emotions are within the thought-process.

What brings about transformation? There must be change, revolution. We cannot go on day to day as we are doing and have atomic bombs. Social and economic revolutions have no meaning. Again, the inner revolution must be a continuous one. Thought-process is not going to change us; for, ideas breed further ideas and ideologies breed other systems which are in opposition. Realizing that the time-element is valueless, that no regeneration can take place within time, how are we to set about to have transformation?

Question: Can we do anything about it? The moment we try to do something, we seem to imitate some pattern of conduct or another.

Krishnamurti: It is an important question. Can anything be done



to bring about this inward transformation? Any action on my part is within the field of thought as it necessitates choice. What is implied in choice? When is there choice? There is choice only when there are two or more things to choose from. When you go to a shop you set in motion the action of memory - which is comparison, weighing, balancing; you look at various things and then choose. Will choice which is comparison with a past or with a future and which implies postponement of action, lead to transformation? Question: What do you mean by saying that choice implies time?

Krishnamurti: How is choice made? With memory. What is memory? Incomplete experience. If you understand or experience something completely, the psychological memory of it is absent; you may remember the incident but there is no emotional content.

Question: Psychological memory may act subconsciously whereas factual memory is within the superficial layers of consciousness.

Krishnamurti: We are discussing whether transformation can be effected by any action on my part. My action is always within a pattern of action or behaviour known to me, or foreseen by me or decided on by me on my past knowledge. Obviously, such an act will not lead to

transformation. Whatever I do is within the field of such a pattern of action; it is always based upon a thought in the past, the past being memory - factual as well as psychological. Without factual memory, I cannot build a house or build a bridge, I cannot have any verbal communication with others. What do we mean by psychological memory? When do you remember an experience?

Why do you not remember all experiences? Generally, pleasant experiences are remembered and the unpleasant ones are put away, though they may still be in the deeper layers of consciousness. You remember those experiences which have a value given by you as associated with the pleasure you derived. That is, pleasant experiences give you pleasure and you remember them because of that pleasure. Unpleasant experiences are also sometimes remembered as a reference to any possible future conduct. But, what makes you remember an experience?

Question: Vanity of life and pride make us remember.

Krishnamurti: Why? Look at this question practically. You have all had experiences; you think about them, you recall them and you remember them. Why is there this remembrance? Do you remember anything which you have completely finished, an incident or an experience? You have a conversation and you are interrupted; then you go back and complete it mentally. When you face, understand and complete the fact of the death of your child, then you do not have a psychological memory of it. Question: Even when I have completely finished a conversation, I still remember it.

Krishnamurti: Yes. It is factual memory. You and I have a conversation. Until that conversation is completed and until we fully communicate with each other what we want, the significance is not understood.

Question: This conversation is only one part of my life.

Krishnamurti: When a conversation is completely understood, you need not go over the whole of that conversation again though you may remember the incident. The psychological memory uses the factual memory as a means to get something out of it. Even

facts are not remembered unless there is a basis of avoidance or gain. What makes you remember a conversation? When that conversation is not completed or its significance has not been completely understood. When completed and fully understood the contents and the thought-process in regard to that conversation have ceased. If you use the factual memory of a conversation as a means of deriving pleasure, then you remember and dwell upon the conversation. If something - a desire, an intention or a pleasure - drops away, it is gone out of your system. But, when you struggle to give it up, it does not drop away. Therefore, the process of giving up, renouncing, is an incomplete action; and therefore will lead to a remembrance of the things given up, and therefore a strengthening of the entity that gives up. The incomplete conversation leaves a space, a mark which we remember; it is very deep down in the layers of our consciousness and it acts invariably always like a record continuously playing, till we complete that experience. Why does an experience leave a mark? A mind which is marked, has a residue of experiences, cannot experience a new thing like an exposed negative which cannot take a clear impression of a new picture. Such a mind is incapable of acting apart from a pattern of action already known. Until that mark is completely understood, the memory will go on repeating itself.

Why do we hold on to some experiences and reject others? My mind is the repository of all experiences of all humanity. How can such a mind, so completely filled, have anything new? I am the result of incomplete experiences because the past experiences are all incomplete. Experiences are remembered because they are incomplete, because we have not thought about them completely to

their end. We use them as a means of profit or avoidance and therefore remember them.

Question: I don't have a new experience as long as I am the result of incomplete experiences. I cannot have any new thought or new perception as long as my mind is clouded with old thoughts. What am I to do?

Krishnamurti: True. Thought born of incomplete experience cannot meet the new anew and therefore cannot lead to your inward transformation. Now, find out what you will do. Whatever you do is based upon your memory and therefore will not lead you to transformation. You realize, therefore, that you cannot do anything with regard to immediate inward transformation.

Question: I feel intensely and want to do something. As I find I cannot do anything, I feel helpless.

Krishnamurti: Why do you not know? Have you realized that you cannot do anything to transform yourself, first superficially and verbally and then more and more deeply? Have you realized that whatever you do, your action is within the field of the known and therefore you cannot transform yourself by doing anything? If you have realized, then the activities of your mind which wants to do something or other, are all cut one after another and finally you realize deeply that you cannot do anything about it, that you cannot deal with this problem of transformation by your actions.

The main difficulty now is that your mind thinks it can do something or other with this problem and that, if it does not act, it feels uneasy. The mind is therefore restless. Mind acts only through memory and therefore mind kicks against "not acting". Therefore you have to consider and understand the activities of the

memory and the mind in relation to transformation.

Question: There is distraction and also acting with a purpose.

Krishnamurti: Distraction leads to postponement; therefore postponement of any action is an indication of the existence of a distraction. When you are vitally interested in anything, you are not distracted.

Question: Transformation is not in the plane of action.

Krishnamurti: Why? I see the importance of immediate transformation not in terms of time, of a complete regeneration of thought, a clarity, a creativeness. I see myself in tortures. If I find this transformation, then my life will have a meaning. I, therefore, go all along the way finding out which is a distraction and which leads to transformation. As I know and understand them, I am purposive and proceed directly.

This can be made clear by an example. Supposing I live in a well- enclosed fortress and somebody says that there is something marvellous beyond the walls of the fortress. If I want to see that which is beyond the walls, any action that I do in that connection within the limits of the fortress only, is futile. It is only when I break the walls, that I can have a glimpse of what is outside.

When you want to understand something, a child or a picture, you have to be silent, to study, and to watch. Your attitude should be one of watching silently, observing and studying all the time. When you have realized that, whatever you do, you cannot transform yourself, what happens to your action? When you realize the futility of all your actions, what do you do? Can you listen to music with effort? Have you not got to sit absolutely quiet to enjoy music? Similarly, when you have the feeling that you must do

something, it is an indication that you have not yet realized the fact that whatever you do cannot lead you to transformation of any kind.

Question: Is desire in the way of transformation?

Krishnamurti: Is it not? Why do you not find this out for yourself? It is fairly simple to do so with regard to transformation.

Question: If I do nothing, there will be no transformation.

Krishnamurti: How do you know? You realize that transformation is imperative, you feel the need for it. When you know that you cannot do anything about it, then only will you sit down quietly without doing anything. You know that thought-process cannot lead to transformation. Memory is always propelling thought and memory is incomplete experience. Desire also is based on thought-process. The road to Mylapore - which is a factual memory - becomes a psychological memory, when people walking on it give you incomplete experience. Your life consists of incomplete experiences and until you finish them you cannot but act. You have innumerable memories and you have to cleanse them all till your mind is free. Is this possible? No. You cannot cleanse the entire past. Can you by your actions examine all the contents of your consciousness, investigate into the past and finish them one by one? It will take time; the instrument of your investigation is incomplete. You might miss some. Therefore in this examination of your past experiences, you are sure to be caught again. Therefore, what are you to do?

Question: Go out and see what happens to you when you meet a new experience.

Krishnamurti: Can you do it with every one of your

experiences? Even if you do, how long will it take? Again, the intimations from the hidden layers of consciousness have also to be understood and acted upon. Therefore, you cannot do it.

Question: When you can't do it, what can you do? You have to step out or to accept it.

Krishnamurti: Are you in a state when you do not know what to do? When you say that you do not know, what is behind it?

Question: That I want to know.

Krishnamurti: What are you to do when you realize that whatever you do will not lead to transformation? To know what to do, you must know that you do not know what to do. When you say "I do not know", you are reduced to a new position. You are nothing in regard to that.

Question: Is there not the recognition that it is possible to know? Krishnamurti: I cannot get rid of the past, do what I will. What am I to do? I want to do something about it and I cannot do anything. Therefore I don't know what to do with regard to the past or with regard to the future. When after realization, I say I do not know, my mind is very alert, very quiet and in a new state.

Question: It is a state of expectancy.

Krishnamurti: When you expect anything, it is based upon the known, therefore, that mind has not yet realized that it cannot do anything about it. But, if you have realized and then say that you do not know, your mind is extraordinarily alert, more alert than when you positively say "I am this"; this means negative thinking is the highest form of meditation; it is complete cessation of thought. Therefore, "not- knowingness" is the new state of the mind in which the past has disappeared. Unfortunately, you will

never allow your mind to come to that point, your mind does not allow it to come to that point. Thus, there is a way by which the mind can be immediately cleansed of all its past, cleansed of the whole content of consciousness. When the mind is thus cleansed of all its past, there is direct action.

Until you realize and say with the whole of your being "I do not know:", you cannot stop the thought-process i.e., the process of experiencing (perception, contact, sensation, desire, identification), terming (pleasure or pain), and recording (memory and mind).

Question: Until I say "I do not know", I am not free of the past. Is this correct?

Krishnamurti: Why didn't you say now "I don't know"? We have been discussing all along about immediate inward transformation. Do you know what to do to bring about transformation in yourselves? You please experiment with it. When you bring me a gift and I do not want it, it is not mine. Similarly, when you have a problem and when you have realized that you do not know anything about it, then that problem is not yours.

Question: I am not able to get rid of psychological fear.

Krishnamurti: I shall deal with it the next time we meet, as it is already very late.

Why do you find it difficult to say "I do not know"? What do you know except doing some work as a technician or earning money as a lawyer? Technique, gathering of other people's information etc., what else do you know? You are a bundle of memories. Beyond that what are you?

Question: I don't know.



Krishnamurti: Title, house, money - remove all these; what are you? Why do you not say "I don't know, I am nothing". You know nothing. Even all your dreams are within the field of memory and you therefore do not know. Why not acknowledge this? Why not face this nothingness and in facing it say "I don't know". Be completely stripped and say, "I am nobody, I am nothing". It is the recognition of a fact. Why do you not face it? That is your difficulty. Because you have never looked at it, you are never facing it. When you actually come to the state of facing and recognizing yourself as you are, you can say "I don't know, I am nothing"?

There is a way of completely cleansing the mind of the past immediately, and therefore bringing about instantaneous regeneration. This is when you have actually realized and when you say "I don't know". The mind is then unburdened and is swift - not erudite, not clever, not informed - but quiet, passive and extraordinarily alert. Then only there can be full and direct action.

April 20, 1948

## MADRAS 6TH GROUP DISCUSSION 22ND APRIL, 1948

I do not consider it necessary to discuss again about what we talked about the day before yesterday, viz., that as we try to look at every problem in the light of our own opinions and conclusions, it is not possible to arrive at the state where there is both the interval and also the sense of 'not knowing', when alone real comprehension comes into being.

Question: If I understand correctly, you said that we have to feel "I am nothing". How am I to get this feeling?

Question: (1) When I say 'I cannot do anything' to bring about transformation, is it the same as 'I am nothing'? This point requires clarification.

Question: (2) The state preceding that when I say 'I don't know', is when I feel that 'I am nothing'.

Krishnamurti: We shall discuss this now. Are we something? Before you can say you are nothing, you should see what you are.

Question: Our beliefs, our bias, our prejudices, our commitments do not lead us anywhere. This can be experienced; but, to say 'I am nothing' appears to be different.

Krishnamurti: Are you aware that you are something?

Question: When I do something, I feel I am something.

Krishnamurti: When there is conflict, or awareness of resistance, or awareness of action, one feels one is something. Is this correct?

Question: In any thought-process, I feel I am something.

Krishnamurti: So, we think we are something whenever the

thought- process is functioning. Is that it? When there is the continuance of the 'I', I am something. Can we go beyond that or not? Can we go beyond the screen of 'I am'?

Question: Whenever I think, the 'I' comes in. Therefore, I don't know anything beyond that.

Question: (1) When I feel frustrated, I feel I am nothing.

Krishnamurti: When you feel frustrated, when your self-consciousness comes against a barrier which it cannot overcome, your 'I' is enormously strengthened. So, probably you seek other ways to get what you want. The thought-process is certainly not a way of bringing about transformation. Can the past be wiped away? We saw that it is not possible to wipe away yesterdays which are very large in number, by allowing each 'yesterday' to project itself into consciousness and understanding it. This will take a very very long time which we cannot afford to spare. Therefore, we cannot examine completely all these and be free from our entire past. Then we came to the point that you cannot act; because, every act is within the field of resistance. When you have a problem, a real human problem, and you cannot solve it, what do you do?

Question: You do nothing.

Krishnamurti: Have you ever been against such a problem?

Question: Yes. Then, I pushed off the problem and got on with something else.

Krishnamurti: You say that when a problem is insoluble, you go to another. What is the state of the mind previous to the verbal expression 'I don't know', especially when the problem demands an urgent solution? Here is a problem that immediate

transformation is necessary and you feel that the thought-process cannot lead you to it and that whatever you do is within the thought-process. As the problem demands an answer, you feel that it is imperative to find out the solution and you are quite willing to find it out. Then you find that you are unable to do anything about it. So long as you think that you must do some action, either on your own volition or by pressure from outside, it is still within the field of thought and therefore it cannot lead to the solution of the problem. When you come to this point, what is the state of your mind?

Question: Despair.

Question: (1) My mind has become still, alert and watchful.

Krishnamurti: What happens now to it? Do you not see the imperative necessity for transformation and that whatever you do is a barrier? Question: I begin to pray.

Krishnamurti: Prayer is another form of thought-process and it will not lead you anywhere. I want to know now what the state of your mind is when it has enquired and felt this need for immediate, constant revolution, constant renewal and regeneration. Thought which is the response of memory, the outcome of a response to a challenge, cannot do anything. You realize the deep significance of saying "there must be immediate transformation", but thought cannot do this. No action is possible and you cannot do anything about this to bring about transformation.

Question: We are not thinking anything at all.

Question: (1) My mind is absolutely quiet, standing still.

Krishnamurti: Go into it please. What does absolute stillness mean?

There is an interval between two thoughts, between the ending of one thought and the arising of another. Without that interval thought would be continuous. What is happening in that interval? Have you watched your own process of mind?

Question: I feel nothing, but consciousness is not extinct. The sense of the 'I' is not there.

Krishnamurti: Let us view it differently. As long as I know the solution to a problem, I have no difficulty. I have a new problem and I have no previous ready-made answer. It is an entirely new problem. How will I tackle it? Regeneration can take place only immediately and I cannot do anything about it. To understand completely, I must come with a fresh mind, a mind free from the residue left by previous experiences. What is the state of your mind now when you similarly face this problem?

Question: A state of expectancy.

Krishnamurti: Is that so? My mind is not asleep. It is extraordinarily alert. The difficulty is to recognize the problem as new. If you see an entirely new insect, you will find it very difficult to recognize it, to focus on it; the whole thing appears to be blurred to you so far as that insect is concerned. Generally speaking, the mind sees quicker and more than the eye, and mind is more aware than the eye. Why? Because the mind has recorded all such things and memory is functioning. If you are face to face with a new thing like this insect and the mind has no memory, the mind is out of focus; and you have to observe the thing much more closely till the mind builds up sufficient memory through which it can recognize it; the eye has therefore to make much greater effort to observe.

Suppose the mind, accustomed to deal with some problems, faces a new problem. It looks to all the previous answers to find an answer to the new problem. However, as the problem is entirely new, memory will not help and there will be no response from the old. Therefore, the mind is not in focus with this new problem. In other words, the mind does not look at the problem but always tries to look to the record it has already built up. As the problem demands a new point of view, it is not able to find a ready-made answer from the old records which it searches to find an answer. Since it cannot find an answer to the new problem, your saying "I am expecting" means that you are not observing the problem but only waiting for an answer to come out of the old. If you see that all this attempt to get an answer to the new problem by a reference to your past memories, is futile, then you do not expect, you do not watch. What is your mind doing then?

Question: Cessation of thought.

Question: (1) I am expecting to hear what you are going to say next.

Krishnamurti: Watch your own mind. I am only unfolding my own mind. I am now focusing my attention on the problem itself and my eyes are focused on the new insect without translating the insect in terms of what I have seen in the past. Therefore, my attitude is not one of expectation or interpretation.

Are there other screens intervening between me and the problem? There is the desire to be transformed which urges me to look at the problem; this means, I want a result. I want to do something, seeking a result; and therefore I am creating the actor who is going to do something. The desire to be transformed implies

the desire for an end, which creates the actor who wants to do something. This desire for transformation is a very difficult screen to get rid of.

Question: This is part of the problem itself.

Krishnamurti: That is so. The mind wants to translate the new into the old but the new insect says "I am entirely new and you cannot understand me if you bring in any of your old". The psychological demand for a result is preventing me from looking at the new. My looking for a result out of the new is entirely different from my looking at the new.

Desire for an end creates action and the action creates the actor. The actor says "I will get it." Here there is no necessity for a result, no necessity for an actor. The problem is not that I must transform myself but that there must be immediate transformation in me. You must not seek a way of using transformation. Any expectation from the past as an answer to the new, any interpretation based on that past, or any desire for an end or to seek a result - all these must go as these are barriers to my understanding the problem.

Is there any other screen? When my mind has wiped away the three screens referred to above as irrelevant, then what is the state of my mind? My mind is new, fresh and can look at the new problems anew. The mind is transformed, because it is no longer the old as it has been cleansed of the past and has become the new.

The importance is to see that this cleansing of the mind can be done and done immediately.

I started out to understand the new insect which I had never seen before. The mind, being out of focus, battles with it and tries to translate the insect in terms of the old. No help, however, comes

out of the past. Therefore, the eye observes the insect more closely. I have no desire for a result out of this insect because I do not know the insect nor how to use it. In such a state I am merely observing the insect.

Action creates the actor. First there is perception, then contact, pleasure, then more action. Thus we have desire, end in view, action and then actor. Which comes first, action or actor? Action is first. First there is perception, then contact, then sensation and then only desire. In desire you have the 'I' and the 'mine' but the 'I' and the 'mine' comes into existence only after action which consists of perception, contact, and sensation. We are always used to think in terms of getting a result, when the 'I' is strengthened.

I know that there must be transformation. I don't know what this transformation is and what it will do. When do I say that transformation is imperative? Only when I see the futility of all that I have done and all that I can do. This thinking out, after full examination of the problem, implies intelligence. When I am looking for a new approach, I am still expecting something from the old. So, expectation goes and then the interpreter. My mind has now become sharper in itself. I may have thrown out the Master but not the desire to achieve. My approach is not to get anything but to see and to understand the new approach, not to get a result. Seeking a result means being caught with the old. We want a result to become something, to become happy, etc., all this implies strife. So, this goes when there is more and more observation and intelligence.

When all these three screens go, the mind is new, all attention. It has examined all the things that are not worthwhile, and



discarded them. Then only it has become new.

Because you have not discarded these screens but are playing with them, you do not see the need for transformation. The problem exists as long as the screens exist. In the removal of the screens is freedom. The removal of the screens can be done immediately, now; then there will be regeneration.

There is no "how to be transformed". If you go after it now, it is done. That is the beauty of it.

That state when the mind is cleansed of the past, corresponding to a clean slate, is the state of "not knowing". This state is the state of highest activity. When the cup is empty, something new can be put into it; but, if there is already some tea in a cup you can only fill it up with tea and not with anything new. Therefore, the mind has to be cleansed of the past to view a new problem anew.

April 22, 1948

## **MADRAS 7TH GROUP DISCUSSION 25TH APRIL, 1948**

We have been discussing about the importance of individual transformation as that alone would lead to a world revolution; about the importance of not thinking in terms of the mass as mass is really non-existent, or of not thinking in terms of a system as no system can lead to transformation; that transformation cannot take place through the thought-process as any thinking about the problem will only lead to further conditioning and resistance; that sentimentality, devotion and emotion are all in the field of thought which is the same as the field of sensation and will not lead to fundamental transformation. We also enquired what were the barriers to the recognition of the problem. We said that they might be: -

- (1) Repetitive experience which prevents direct relationship with the problem. To deal with a human problem we look to memory for help and this cannot lead to the solution of a problem.
- (2) The interpreter which is the memory acting on a problem. So long as there is the interpreter, the problem cannot be seen simply.
- (3) Looking for a result. This prevents a direct communion with the problem. The result, the end is always static, whereas the problem is not static. Therefore, when you look at a problem as a means of getting a result or leading to a result, you cannot understand the problem.

When these three screens are removed, mind is cleansed and is new. When the mind is thus transformed, the problem is directly seen and it is then no longer a problem at all.

Transformation cannot be brought about through time, through

growth, through evolution, through a series of lives. There can be no inward revolution through a process of time. Immediate inward revolution is possible only through understanding. Therefore, the removal of the screens must come as an experience. It should not be a process of repetition, i.e., because others have said, etc. We can keep our mind fresh and new only by our own constant experiencing.

Is it possible to approach the problem of immediate transformation differently? Question: It has been asked by some why the process of the mind seems clear when you talk about it. I find the same thing happening to my mind; but, when I go home, my mind goes back into the old groove. Why is this? Again, I do not recognize for myself the existence of any ill- will or evil which recreates itself in the minds of others or causes chaos in society.

Krishnamurti: Surely, there is a repetitive evil which arises inside you, which projects itself into society as anti-social actions, etc.

Question: That may not have always something to do with strife. It may be often personal.

Krishnamurti: What is society?

Question: Gita says "How does it happen that human mind turns to evil rather than good".

Krishnamurti: I have not studied the Gita. Why is it easier to bring about co-operation between people through hatred, through greed, through evil? If there is to be any social reform, you cannot bring people together. Why is it easier to injure another, to be inconsiderate, rather than to be kind and generous? Have you not seen how when clothed in evil, good can be pursued more easily?

Question: An object of hatred makes for the binding of all those who also hate that object.

Krishnamurti: Is that the reason? Supposing you say that we can all join together and produce something which will be for the good of all of us. Will they join? Why do people more easily choose evil action than good action?

Question: Submission to authority.

Krishnamurti: Apart from authority, is there not anything else? A thoughtful man will not readily obey an authority in matters in which he does not agree.

Question: Because there is some prospect of getting something in the immediate future, people follow the evil rather than the good. Krishnamurti: Why do we choose the path that is evil more readily than good?

Question: Inherited savagery in our blood.

Krishnamurti: Greed is considered profitable though ultimately it is destructive. Society is the projection of the inward state of the individual in daily life. I know greed will ultimately lead to destruction, yet I pursue greed. Why? What you say is that the immediate is dictating and not the result. The ultimate is really the immediate. In any case, to separate yourself from society is not correct. If your relationship with society is based on some qualities, those qualities are bound to be impressed on the society with which you are in immediate relationship. Generally, whenever a thing gives you pleasure, you pursue it.

Question: I do not understand you, Sir. The pursuit of a certain quality which we do not name, is itself a result of conflict.

Krishnamurti: Surely not. The first movement is not the action

of conflict. You pursue something, or go after something, in order to gain or to avoid. Your whole existence is based on an attempt either to gain or to avoid.

Question: Is insensitivity the result of an action to gain or to avoid?

Krishnamurti: Why insensitivity? Why are you insensitive to what you call good and sensitive to what you call evil?

Question: Because insensitivity takes beyond the ambit of pain.

Question: (2) If I get pleasure, can I make myself sensitive?

Krishnamurti: Why do I pursue quality? Is it because I am sensitive, or am lacking in clarity?

Question: To answer this correctly, you will have to study the whole history of mankind.

Krishnamurti: Yes. But will not this study of the whole history by yourself take infinite time? You are also likely to miss some chapters. So, it is not practical to say that "I shall answer when I know the whole of my past". There must be another method.

Question: Is it truer to say that the quality grips me, rather than that I follow the quality?

Question: (1) Am I different from the qualities?

Krishnamurti: True. Why does the self follow one quality in preference to another?

Question: When you follow anger, does anger give you pleasure?

Krishnamurti: Certainly, Sir, when you let off steam.

We either pursue for the sake of pleasure, to gain something, or for the sake of avoidance. All effort to pursue a quality depends on pleasure and avoidance. When you know that pleasure is going to

bring ultimate destruction, why do you pursue it? Because you really do not know definitely for yourself that it is painful ultimately. Why do you not see that, in the course of pleasure, diseases and pains are involved and why do you not therefore immediately drop the pleasure?

Anger affects the body. Is anger a worthy means of cohesion of people, of society? Not at all. Yet, why are we angry? Do you know that anger acts as a barrier? If you know, why are you angry? When you know a certain thing is poison, you do not play with it and taste it. What is it that prevents you from knowing that anger is a poison; and why do you not leave it alone?

Question: Everyone of us has a tendency to manufacture some unnamed proclivity to evil. Why is it?

Krishnamurti: You know the bad effects of anger and yet why do you pursue anger?

Question: Because I don't know it is a poison.

Krishnamurti: Why do you not know? I am angry and I want to stop it immediately. How do I do it? Only when I can read the contents of anger with full attention, give anger my whole being and understanding. If you want to get a result, should you not give your whole mind and heart to it? A quality like anger is not recognized as poison till your whole being is given to the understanding of it, till you give your whole undivided attention to it.

Question: I understand anger only after I am angry and not while I am angry.

Krishnamurti: Anger is a response to a challenge. If I am not afraid of any danger and if I understand anger, then I shall not get

angry.

You pursue certain qualities because you have not studied them, because you are not interested in being aware of them. If you understand anger, you are transformed immediately. For instance, smoking is first a nausea to you. Then it becomes a habit and then a source of pleasure. When you understand this process and when you understand the nature of smoking, then, smoking falls away. If you relate the habit of smoking to other habits also, then, in understanding the habit of smoking fully, you understand also the nature of all habits and you will be transformed.

Thus, we pursue a quality because we have not gone into it deeply, or into ourselves deeply, in order to understand it. Mere liberation from a smoking habit does not lead to a chain of liberations from other habits unless you fully understand all the implications of habit as such. There is regeneration, if there is constant watchfulness. Regeneration is not an end-result but from moment to moment.

Why is it not possible to understand something which we call evil, completely so that it drops away? Obviously because we do not want to study the problem and all its implications. We require a lot of time. It means action in your way of living, which may lead to more and more trouble. As you do not want to be involved in any more trouble, you are not serious, earnest, about any of these things. You like to lead a superficial life, avoiding pain and seeking pleasure. You want to avoid pain merely because you like to live superficially. You are inwardly dull, insensitive to your problem. Sensitivity means constant ache and therefore you are insensitive.

War is evil and I want to avoid war. I want to understand and transform my own existence, to find out if, in me, there is violence and conflict - either between you and me, or in myself. Therefore, I must study the problem completely first in myself. I am always seeking a result and this leads to conflict. I see this and also that it is unproductive and does not lead to creativeness. I also see that this contradiction in myself really means lack of clarity of thought. Then, I see that I am not seeking clarity, but I want to understand contradiction. Then, when I do not seek anything but am merely observing closely in order to understand contradiction, contradiction ceases.

Love is not a quality, an emotion or sentiment. There is no quality of like and dislike in love. If you see a thing directly, it drops; and you cannot see a thing directly, if you want a result. To understand violence, you should have no screen such as the ideal of non-violence or the idealism of non-violence. To pursue an ideal is really an escape from dealing directly with violence. You can never understand anything through an ideal.

How do you understand sorrow? Not by escaping from sorrow, by seeking a remedy. If your intention is to understand sorrow, then you must watch, study every movement of thought, study every escape. Then, when you understand all this, your mind does not run away from sorrow. Giving explanations about sorrow does not mean understanding sorrow. When I completely understand all the escapes which are created by me in order to avoid sorrow or to arrive at certain results, then escapes drop away. When escapes have been cleansed from my mind, then only, my mind is face to face with sorrow.



In understanding sorrow, escapes arise. In probing into them, I find that when I grieve over the death of my son, I have really used my son as an escape from myself. Being afraid to discover what I am, I have been seeking fulfilment in my son. I escape from something which is myself and which is not known to me, from my emptiness, my insufficiency and my poverty. Because my son is not there, I am confronted with my poverty which causes me sorrow. Thus, I am face to face with my loneliness, my emptiness.

As long as you escape from 'what is', you will have sorrow, and you pursue all the escapes. When you understand and when you are not escaping, then you are experiencing your own true state of emptiness. In this state of experiencing, there is no experiencer or experience. After experiencing, you are aware of the experiencer having had an experience. As long as you are escaping from 'what is', there is always the experiencer frightened with what he is going to experience. Truth only can free you from escapes. When you realize that you are that thing which you actually are, there is no longer any escape. When you experience loneliness, in experiencing, loneliness drops away and there is no problem. Therefore, sorrow disappears when there is the experiencing of that emptiness. Any other form of resolving sorrow is an escape. Here is the key to the problem of sorrow. It is only in the state of experiencing when there is neither the experiencer nor the experience, that there is instantaneous transformation.

Question: Does not one get out of this state when he has once had it?

Krishnamurti: Why are you anxious about this? Experiencing is from moment to moment; there is also the prolonging of the

interval. It is sufficient even if you have that state even for a split second. Wanting to be other than 'what is', is really an escape. If you understand 'what is' completely, then a miracle happens.

April 23, 1948

## **MADRAS 8TH GROUP DISCUSSION 27TH APRIL, 1948**

When we last met we came up to the point when we began to question why people generally have a tendency to follow more easily evil rather than good. In the course of this discussion, we saw that all escapes - so-called noble or ignoble, beneficial to society or anti-social - brought about sorrow and not the understanding of sorrow. It is only when we realize and face our own emptiness, loneliness etc., that we can have a solution to our sorrow. We also saw that where there was pursuit of pleasure or avoidance of pain or pleasure which is called ignoble or unrighteous, we can never understand the true nature of the problem. We generally pursue pleasure because the pleasure that we derive thereby, gives further nourishment or expansion to our 'self', i.e., to the me and the mine. Similarly, we avoid that which diminishes or contradicts or denies the self, the 'I'. Whenever there is the pursuit of self- expansion, it is easier to follow it. When there is a blocking of that expansion, we avoid it. Therefore, we follow that which we call evil, the path of strife, violence etc. None of us want to be eradicated psychologically, we want to be something - a writer, a politician and so on. Where the self finds no issue, we try to avoid it.

Question: Why is hatred a greater cementing factor than love?

Krishnamurti: I said the other day that fear, threat to security, binds people together. Where the self can find root, it uses it as a means of 'becoming'. The denial of the self is love, but it is not cohesive because we cling to self.

Question: The pursuit of both good and evil may lead to self-expansion.

Krishnamurti: This is not a question of difference between evil and good. Evil and good are both so-called. The point is that where there is scope for self-expansion, there you pursue it whether it is the so-called good or so-called evil.

Question: Is there not cussedness, a behaviour-compulsive, in human nature? Why are we cussed?

Krishnamurti: Are you cussed by nature? Why is there not a regeneration of the individual when he has explored the various avenues of his thought, feeling and action, and found their full significance? What is it that brings about a revolution in the individual? Our brains are sufficiently clear; we have thought about our actions, our relationship etc., and yet the quality which makes for immediate transformation, seems to be lacking.

Question: Is there such a catalyst? Can we look for it?

Krishnamurti: Is there a catalyst, or what is the new approach? What do we mean by transformation? Question: A state of not having a memory or not having an ego, a negative state.

Krishnamurti: Is that what we mean by transformation? We have moments when the self is absent, when the sense of the me and the mine is absent, i.e., without the conscious awareness of the experiencer and the experience. When you get a shock, in moments of great joy or sorrow, the self is driven out, there is no sense of the me.

Question: Can the me be completely dissolved, never to return? Is that transformation?

Krishnamurti: That is the classical understanding of

transformation. Is there not a different approach?

Question: As we have not experienced it, we cannot say what transformation is.

Krishnamurti: All you can do is to be free of conflict, when sorrow ceases. When you free yourself from conflict or sorrow, something may happen. The mind creates the problem and the problem which is

identification and condemnation and justification, brings about sorrow. The past absorbs the present, modifies it and continues on into the future. This is all one continuous movement.

Why should the mind create the problem?

Question: Conflicting desires.

Krishnamurti: Can you not put an end to these desires? Why have we to strive and to struggle, keep on asserting and denying etc.? Why should we not live from moment to moment and as each problem arises understand it and resolve it, and so on? Why can't you do that? Problems arise. Why do you not deal with each problem completely without allowing it to leave a residue?

Question: A memory is already there and it is bound to condition the new.

Krishnamurti: Why should you not deal with the new as new, free from conditioning. If I am aware of the conditioning in me, can I not meet the next problem without the conditioned mind?

Question: We may have some conditioning of which we are not conscious. Krishnamurti: True. But if your intention is to meet the new without any conditioning by your past, then you are extraordinarily alert and you are aware of the conditioning. Transformation is the meeting of the new as new, without any

conditioning whatsoever, i.e., to meet each new problem anew.

Question: This is impossible. If you have memory, that memory is bound to condition all your thoughts under all circumstances.

Krishnamurti: Can I meet a problem anew? Yes, but only if I have got the intention to be aware of the conditioning and to be free of such conditioning, whatever be the level of consciousness. I see that I can only understand a problem if I meet it anew. Then, I will welcome any opportunity which will open up this conditioning so that, by my being aware of it, that conditioning may drop away.

Question: Has conditioning a bio-chemical aspect in it? How will it be affected by my awareness?

Krishnamurti: Just as I recognize everything else, social, industrial or religious etc., I can understand a problem only when I meet it anew. As I have got so many memories, the whole human treasure, I cannot analyze every one of them. There are some conditionings of which I am aware; but, there are also other conditionings of which I am not aware. My intention is to meet the problem anew and to be free of all

conditioning. Therefore, I recognize my state of conditioning factually as well as unconsciously; I also recognize that I cannot resolve them all and that I cannot solve the problem unless I meet it without any conditioning whatsoever. I cannot investigate into the whole content of consciousness; yet, I must meet the problem anew.

Question: Have you not then a purpose, an object to be gained?

Krishnamurti: No. The purpose is the outcome of the conditioning and it translates the problem.

Question: If you have no purpose, there is no problem. Why

should I solve the problem?

Krishnamurti: When you have got a purpose, can you dissolve the problem? Question: A problem is not absolute, it relates to man. The purpose is to enlarge the freedom of the individual.

Krishnamurti: Any problem is one of food, things, relationship, or ideas. You talk of the freedom of the individual. Freedom from what? Is it freedom to be more expansive, more stupid, more national? Freedom for the self to expand is not freedom at all. The self is a contradiction, it is limited; the more it expands, the more is it limited and in contradiction. An experience becomes a problem when it is not fully understood, i.e., when it is acted on by past conditioning, conscious or not. This experience gives pain. How am I to dissolve this pain? I can do so only when there is no thought of the past, when there is no conditioning. The mind always knows the fact of its conditioning, conscious or unconscious; and yet, it can understand only when it meets the problem anew without any conditioning. What is the conditioning of such a mind? What is it to do?

Question: Instead of finding out ways and means, stop thinking.

Krishnamurti: What is the state of mind at this stage? Is it a wrong question to put?

Question: Is not the problem itself a part of conditioning? Therefore, every problem is impossible of solution.

Krishnamurti: Let us investigate it. Is not this a false question? Because the more I use the conditioning, the more it strengthens itself and I cannot investigate into the whole of my consciousness. When I realize this, what is the state of my mind?

Question: There is this problem of death, losing one child, then

another and then my wife being ill, all these coming one after another in quick succession. How can I understand the problem without bringing in my past conditioning, like my belief in reincarnation, etc.?

Krishnamurti: There is death and suffering. Do I meet it with my religious conditioning? What is the state of my mind when I meet the problem of death? Let us discuss this.

Question: My mind is passive, observing, not waiting to do anything with the problem but merely observing it. You can see how the memory is coming in in everything that I observe in this way. I come again and again to the problem pushing the memory away. Is not my thinking that I should meet the problem anew based upon my memory?

Krishnamurti: Not necessarily. It is only a verbalization of what is taking place in your mind.

Question: The problem is only the memory.

Krishnamurti: To experiment with anything, you should not be too ready to verbalize. The problem is new and you cannot have a ready-made answer. I am gradually discovering the ways in which memory operates over a problem. This gentleman says that he is in a fix; this is because he is thinking in the old way to find the solution. When you have a new approach, you do not think of solving the problem. Memory is a positive approach and it is positive. A solution along any negative line only can lead to Truth, as the positive approach which is through memory is always conditioned by memory. Therefore, my mind in the state referred to by me is in a state of negation, which is not really the opposite of the positive; the mind is much more alert than when it is doing a



positive action. When the mind is in this negative state, i.e., when the approach is negative, the mind should not create a process of thought; the mind is incapable of thought and it is not asleep, nor is it expecting an answer.

Choice is inaction. Positive action based on memory, on conditioning, is really inaction. Real action is when my mind is new and when, in the new state, it meets the problem anew.

What is the state of mind when it has no positive action towards the problem? You cannot pre-conceive that state; you must experience that state. If there is any choice, then the action is positive. Any voice, the inner or the voice of the Master, is still conditioning. Conditioning means no action. An action of choice is really the avoidance of 'what is'; it is therefore no action but only inaction.

Any response, positive or negative, coming out of the conditioning is not true action. When I experience that state of mind, I may find the new approach.

It is extremely difficult not to have a positive action towards a problem. A positive action is an action based on choice, on memory. When the mind is not positively acting on a vital problem, what is its state? Have you any vital problem?

Question: Yes, the illness of a relative, which is giving me pain.

Krishnamurti: How do you approach it?

Question: I am trying to do my best in the matter. My approach to this is really a positive action of my memory. I do not know what else I can do.

Krishnamurti: We are experimenting now. It is no use waiting and seeing. I have a living vital problem. I recognize that any

positive action is valueless. What is the state of my mind? I cannot verbalize at that particular state, but only afterwards.

Questioner: There is blankness in my mind.

Krishnamurti: True. Supposing it is not blankness, what is the next step? As it is a new state which we have not experienced before, you cannot call it blank; it cannot be merely blank. It has pushed out positive action.

Question: I am now in a state when I surrender.

Krishnamurti: Surrender to whom or to what? Are you experiencing? You feel something and you do not proceed further.

Question: I am paying attention.

Krishnamurti: This means that there must be the giver of attention. You have now been forced to experience that state. When I am forcing you to that state, you are avoiding it.

Question: My experience is that such a mind is open to receive whatever it is.

Krishnamurti: In such a mind, there is no desire, no seeking an end; nor is there an actor. What is the state of that mind? For this experience to take place, the mind must have pushed away all attempts at positive action, without any effort or struggle. Therefore, such a mind is in a state of negative activity. This means really that you have stopped the interpreting of the problem.

What does negative activity mean? The mind is alert and in a state of negative activity; that means, there is no desire and no seeking of a result. What is the next response? Nothing is happening in the mind. What is the next movement out of this nothingness? Put away the question and the response, and watch again. You get blocked at this stage because probably you are not

accustomed to this. You try this again and see what is happening.

We should proceed with this experience of yours when we meet next Thursday. The whole of this is awareness and there is the fun of discovery in understanding this.

April 27, 1948

## **MADRAS 9TH GROUP DISCUSSION 29TH APRIL, 1948**

We have been discussing for the past few days the problem of individual transformation and why it has not been possible for you to effect immediate transformation. We saw that transformation can take place only in the Now and not in the hereafter; any form of approach which involves thinking in terms of time, evolution, growth, leads to postponement. All of our philosophy which is based on this conception of growth is erroneous. Thought-process cannot bring about transformation. Thought implies a constant response of the conditioned mind; this conditioning is due to memory which is the residue of incomplete experience. We are the product of the memory, of the mind; therefore, no process of the mind can solve any problem except a factual problem. All human problems are changing and not static. Therefore, a mind that has a fixed opinion or a conclusion cannot understand a new problem. Emotions, feelings, cannot lead to transformation. Emotions and sentimentality are within the field of the mind and they are sensations. Therefore, they cannot solve the problem.

Devotion, immolation of oneself to an idea, to a guru, to an object, to God, cannot lead to transformation. There is always, in this, the seeking of an end; there is always a process of sentimentality and emotion in this and it is merely clothed in the form of devotion. Therefore, devotion also is in the field of the mind and cannot lead to transformation. When we put aside all the above screens or barriers to understanding, what is left with us? When all these forms of intellection are removed, there is an

inward sense of creative being. There is no problem outside the mind; so, when the mind is cleansed, we are face to face with the problem.

When the problem is thus confronted and when there is no response from the mind which is the past, we are not concerned with anything. The mind has understood that all the responses of memory, because they are thought-processes, are no good for bringing about transformation. Therefore, all these responses are put aside and the mind confronts the problem. It is only when you directly experience this state that you will see what difference it makes.

What is the actual state of the mind when the mind is alert and when there is no action of memory on the problem or when there is no desire for a result?

We said that the mind was still; stillness was a direct experience. If it is not a direct experience to you, do not use words. When the mind is not acting on the problem, we experience first a stillness. There is no verbal expression for that state yet. The mind is not asleep. The whole content of consciousness, not merely the superficial layer, is quiet. If the superficial layers only are still, the deeper layers will project themselves into the superficial and there will be the pulsations of the past, the promptings of the deeper layers. Therefore, this state of quietness where there is no such prompting, is the one corresponding to the quietness at all levels of consciousness. In that state, we are not naming and recording. When we are not recording an experience, it is really the state of experiencing, in which there is neither the experiencer nor the experience. When the experience fades away, there arises the

experiencer and the experience, the thinker and the thought. This stillness is not the result of a desire. Desire or seeking a result creates action; from action the actor is born. Therefore, if there is seeking for a result, there cannot be stillness.

Question: Did I not push out all the thoughts that arose in my mind, in order to bring about stillness?

Krishnamurti: No. You did not push out, but your understanding of the thought-process led to the thoughts dropping away by themselves. As long as there is an effort to exclude a thought, that effort is a barrier to understanding and therefore a barrier to stillness. The desire to seek an end creates action which in turn breeds the actor. As long as you do not understand that memory cannot solve a human problem, your effort to push away, which is based only on memory, cannot produce stillness of the mind. When there is a vital insistent problem of daily life, you view it with memory and therefore it is conditioned. When you realize that no action of memory can lead to understanding, then memory ceases to function and the mind is no longer acting on the problem, and therefore the mind is still.

In this state, the past has been wiped away, even if it be only for a split second. Memory is always waiting to creep in and therefore a thought may arise during this interval of stillness. The understanding of this makes the mind very watchful and very alert; it is also still. The mind that has been cultivated, made to expand, by self-expansion, has now realized that all this is to be put away; therefore, all this drops away and the mind is silent. In that silence, there is neither the experiencer nor the experience, but only the state of experiencing, of stillness which is not static but with an

extraordinary activity. Only the stillness which is the product of memory, is static.

Question: Mind is still and seems to be non-existent.

Krishnamurti: We are discussing not the stillness of the mind but the state of the mind when memory is not acting on the problem. There is stillness and in that state something happens. If I tell you anything strongly, you accept it even if you have no experiencing; this is hypnotism.

Question: When I understand that memory conditions, I do not find memory acting and there is stillness. I tried to experiment then with the suffering of another whom I knew. I then felt as though I was myself suffering and not the other person of whom I was thinking. Then the thinking crept in.

Krishnamurti: We are trying to find out what it means to have this constant revolution inside us, regeneration. Mere modification of memory is not transformation. As long as there is a movement of memory, there cannot be any regeneration. Regeneration is a new state which I do not know; and I must approach it through negation, and understand it negatively. Any response of memory, however fleeting, cannot produce regeneration. When I see it, the response of memory drops away. It may come back again; but, if I see it again, again it drops away. From every movement of this thought, there is creative existence. When memory is in abeyance, the mind is very quiet. By constant watchfulness, this interval arises when thought does not act at all. What comes out of this interval?

When the mind is in such a state, there is a natural expansive awareness which is not exclusive; i.e., there is a state of

concentration without a concentrator. The process is as follows -

I want to know every form of memory and I am watchful. When any thought arises it is examined and its truth seen. Then that thought drops away. There is no discipline, effort, struggle, involved in this.

Question: What happens when, in that state, there is a desire?

Krishnamurti: All desire is thought.

The understanding mind is denuding itself of all thoughts and there is also the lengthening of the interval between thought and thought. What happens in that interval? The interval has been experienced. When thought arises in that interval, that thought is examined with greater quickness, anew. The lengthening of the interval between two thoughts gives greater capacity to deal with any thought that may arise in that interval. The experiencing of this interval is what we are now considering. There is a vitality in this interval. In this interval all effort has stopped; there is no choice, no condemnation, no justification, and no identification; there is also no interpretation of any kind.

Question: What is meant by examining the thought, in the state of silence? It is not I suppose merely to recognize it as a form of memory and to push it out, which is a process of choice and effort, but to recognize the significance of it.

Krishnamurti: We are trying to see if the new can be met anew and understood without the burden of the past. Meeting of the new as the new is regeneration. I have understood a thought and that thought disappears. There is an interval of calm and clarity. Then a thought arises. How do I deal with that thought? If I try to deal with it with my memory, I cannot deal with it. Can you examine



the thought without your memory?

Question: I do not push that thought away. The thought disappears of itself.

Krishnamurti: How do you deal with the thought without memory? Don't say who is dealing with it and so on. Do you condemn or analyze the thought or what do you do with it? Has not that interval a relationship with that thought? Does not that interval which is a state of being, which is new, meet the old which is the thought arising? This means the new is meeting the old; but, the new cannot absorb the old. The old can absorb the new and modify it; but the new cannot absorb the old. Therefore the new always extends and the old disappears by itself. There is no exclusion, no suppression, nor condemnation, nor avoidance. It is in this manner that the thought arising in the interval disappears.

What happens in the interval? In experiencing that interval and communicating it, you must also be experiencing in order to see my communication. In that interval, another thought comes in. I recognize it. The mind in the form of that thought is now facing the interval which is new. The new is operating on the old and the old cannot be absorbed by the new, and therefore the thought disappears. This interval is extraordinary in that it is without thought, without effort, without choice.

Question: Will there be pure perception then?

Krishnamurti: In that interval, there will be complete cessation of desires. That interval is alert, passive, choiceless awareness. There is cessation of desire, cessation of thought. In that state which is experiencing, communication is impossible; i.e., words cannot be a means of experience. In that state, there is no

sensation; and sensation is thought-process and thought-process is verbal. If you and I are experiencing the same state, then, because it is non-sensuous, we can understand each other.

Regeneration is not a factor depending upon me; because, it cannot be brought about by any effort or any struggle on my part. In itself, that interval is living, it has action. I don't have to hold on to it and say 'it must live'. Without causation which is from memory, this interval lives by itself and it also gets lengthened. There is the experiencing of such a state in which there is no cause and effect. There is a state of being without causation, with no time in it (no yesterday producing today and no today producing tomorrow), a state without time and yet living vitally. In other words, this is a state of being in which there is living full of vitality, which has no causation and therefore timeless, and yet without death. There is also a newness which is not repetitive. That state is creation. In that state there is no effort; but, a new birth takes place always, a transformation not in terms of time taking place all the time.

To sum up, this state of being is not exclusive, is not manufactured by will, is not the result of the past, is not the end of a desire, but is a state of real action without a cause, timeless, living and undergoing a transformation in itself.

Experiencing and deepening of that state is also taking place. It is not one isolated experience but it is a state of constant experiencing. Therefore, regeneration is a constant revolution inside us. This regeneration is new and it will meet every problem anew. If that is functioning, that new meets the old without being contaminated by the old. Therefore, such a man can live even in

the midst of a greedy world without being affected by that greed, but himself altering the greed in the world. This new is always moving and it transforms everything it meets.

Now, your difficulty is not understanding a problem at all, but to have that interval between two thoughts. Therefore, you do not want to strive to be good, to be non-violent etc. You are only concerned with that interval with which you can live from moment to moment. You have no problem and nothing to maintain; for, as that interval functions, the problems as they arise will be promptly dealt with, by the new meeting the old without being in any way contaminated by the old.

April 29, 1948