


# Tradition and Revolution



J KRISHNAMURTI

**- New Delhi, 1970 -**

Dialogue 1 - THE FLAME OF SORROW

Dialogue 2 - ALCHEMY AND MUTATION

Dialogue 3 - THE CONTAINMENT OF EVIL

Dialogue 4 - THE AWAKENING OF ENERGY

Dialogue 5 - THE FIRST STEP IS THE LAST STEP

Dialogue 6 - ENERGY AND TRANSFORMATION

Dialogue 7 - THE OBSERVER AND WHAT IS

Dialogue 8 - THE BACKWARD FLOWING MOVEMENT

Dialogue 9 - TIME AND DETERIORATION

Dialogue 10 - DYING AND LIVING

Dialogue 11 - BEAUTY AND PERCEPTION

**- Madras, 1971 -**

Dialogue 12 - THE PARADOX OF CAUSATION

Dialogue 13 - TRADITION AND KNOWLEDGE

Dialogue 14 - CONFLICT AND CONSCIOUSNESS

Dialogue 15 - THE NATURE OF EXPLORATION

Dialogue 16 - ORDER AND IDEATION

Dialogue 17 - OBJECT, KNOWLEDGE AND  
PERCEPTION

Dialogue 18 - ENERGY AND FRAGMENTATION

Dialogue 19 - FREEDOM AND THE FIELD

**- Rishi Valley, 1971 -**

Dialogue 20 - THE MATRIX OF TRADITION

Dialogue 21 - THE GURU, TRADITION AND FREEDOM

Dialogue 22 - FREEDOM AND THE PRISON

Dialogue 23 - STABILITY AND KNOWLEDGE

**- Bombay, 1971 -**

[Dialogue 24 - THE BRAIN-CELLS AND MUTATION](#)

[Dialogue 25 - GOD](#)

[Dialogue 26 - ENERGY, ENTROPY AND LIFE](#)

[Dialogue 27 - INTELLIGENCE AND THE INSTRUMENT](#)

[Dialogue 28 - RIGHT COMMUNICATION](#)

[Dialogue 29 - BIOLOGICAL SURVIVAL AND  
INTELLIGENCE](#)

[Dialogue 30 - THE MIND AND THE HEART](#)

**TRADITION AND REVOLUTION PREFACE BY  
PUPUL JAYAKAR AND SUNANDA  
PATWARDHAN NEW DELHI 11TH MAY 1972**

Since 1947 J. Krishnamurti, while in India, has been regularly meeting and holding dialogues with a group of people drawn from a variety of cultural backgrounds and disciplines - intellectuals, politicians, artists, sannyasis. During these years, the methodology of investigation has richened and taken shape. What is revealed in these dialogues, as if through a microscope, is the extraordinarily fluid, vast and subtle mind of Krishnamurti and the operational process of perception. These dialogues are, however, not questions and answers. They are an investigation into the structure and nature of consciousness, an exploration of the mind, its movements, its frontiers and that which lies beyond. It is also an approach to the way of mutation.

There has been in these dialogues a coming together of several totally varied and conditioned minds. There has been a deep challenging of the mind of Krishnamurti, a relentless questioning that has opened up the depths of man's psyche. One is a witness not only to the expanding and deepening of the "limitless" but also to its impact on the limited mind. This very enquiry leaves the mind flexible, freeing it from the immediate past and from the grooves of centuries of conditioning.

In these dialogues Krishnamurti starts questioning from a totally tentative position, from a state of "not-knowing", and in a sense, therefore, he starts at the same level as the participants. During the discussion, various analytical enquiries are made; tentative and

exploratory. There is a questioning without seeking immediate solution: a step by step observation of the processes of thought and its unfoldment - a movement of penetration and withdrawal, every movement plunging attention deeper and deeper into the recesses of the mind. A delicate wordless communication takes place; an exposure of the movement of negation as it meets the positive movement of thought. There is the "seeing" of fact, of "what is", and the mutation of "what is". This is again perceived from various directions to examine its validity.

The nature of duality and non-duality are revealed in simple language. In that state of questioning, a state when the questioner, the experiencer has ceased, in a flash, "truth" is revealed. It is a state of total non-thought.

The mind which is the vessel of movement, when that movement has no form, no "me", no vision, no image, it is completely quiet - In it there is no memory. Then the brain cells undergo a change - The brain cells are used to movement in time. They are the residue of time and time is movement; a movement within the space which it creates as it moves - When there is no movement, there is tremendous focus of energy - So mutation is the understanding of movement, and the ending of movement in the brain cells themselves."

The revelation of the instant of mutation, of "what is", provides a totally new dimension to the whole field of intellectual and religious enquiry.

There may be repetitions in the dialogues but they have not been eliminated, because to do so would have inhibited the understanding of the nature of consciousness and the method of

enquiry.

We feel that these discussions will be of major significance and of assistance to those seeking a clue to the understanding of the self and of life.

# **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 1**

## **NEW DELHI 12TH DECEMBER 1970 'THE FLAME OF SORROW'**

We were walking in the open gardens near a huge hotel. There was a golden blue in the western sky and the noise of the buses, cars went by. There were young plants full of promise, watered daily. They were still building, creating the gardens and a bird was hovering in the sky, fluttering its wings rapidly before it plunged to the earth; and in the east, there was the nearing of the full moon. What was beautiful was none of these things but the vast emptiness that seemed to hold the earth. What was beautiful was the poor man with his head down, carrying a small bottle of oil.

Krishnamurti: What does sorrow mean in this country? How do the people in this country meet sorrow? Do they escape from sorrow through the explanation of karma? How does the mind in India operate when it meets sorrow? The Buddhist meets it in one way, the Christian in another way. How does the Hindu mind meet it? Does it resist sorrow, or escape from it? Or does the Hindu mind rationalize it?

Questioner P: Are there really many ways of meeting sorrow? Sorrow is pain - the pain of someone dying, the pain of separation. Is it possible to meet this pain in various ways?

Krishnamurti: There are various ways of escape but there is only one way of meeting sorrow. The escapes with which we are all familiar are really the ways of avoiding the greatness of sorrow. You see, we use explanations to meet sorrow but these explanations do not answer the question. The only way to meet

sorrow is to be without any resistance, to be without any movement away from sorrow, outwardly or inwardly, to remain totally with sorrow, without wanting to go beyond it.

P: What is the nature of sorrow?

Krishnamurti: There is personal sorrow, the sorrow that comes with the loss of someone you love, the loneliness, the separation, the anxiety for the other. With death there is also the feeling that the other has ceased to be, and there was so much that he wanted to do. All this is personal sorrow. Then there is that man, ill-clad, dirty, with his head down; he is ignorant, ignorant not merely of book knowledge, but deeply, really ignorant. The feeling that one has for the man is not self-pity, nor is there an identification with that man; it is not that you are placed in a better position than he is and so you feel pity for him, but there is within one the sense of the timeless weight of sorrow in man. This sorrow has nothing personal about it. It exists.

P: While you have been speaking, the movement of sorrow has been operating within me. There is no immediate cause for this sorrow but it seems like a shadow, always with man. He lives, he loves, he forms attachments and everything ends. Whatever the truth of what you say, in this there is such an infinitude of sorrow. How is it to end? There appears to be no answer. The other day you said in sorrow is the whole movement of passion. What does it mean?

Krishnamurti: Is there a relationship between sorrow and passion? I wonder what sorrow is. Is there such a thing as sorrow without cause? We know the sorrow which is cause and effect. My son dies; in that is involved my identification with my son, my



wanting him to be something which I am not, my seeking continuity through him; and when he dies all that is denied and I find myself completely emptied of all hope. In that there is self-pity, fear; in that there is pain which is the cause of sorrow. This is the lot of everyone. This is what we mean by sorrow.

Then also there is the sorrow of time, the sorrow of ignorance, not the ignorance of knowledge but the ignorance of one's own destructive conditioning; the sorrow of not knowing oneself; the sorrow of not knowing the beauty that lies at the depth of one's being and the going beyond. Do we see that when we escape from sorrow through various forms of explanation, we are really frittering away an extraordinary happening?

P: Then what does one do?

Krishnamurti: You have not answered my question, "Is there, a sorrow without cause and effect?" We know sorrow and the movement away from sorrow.

P: You have talked of sorrow free of cause and effect. Is there such a state?

Krishnamurti: Man has lived with sorrow from immemorial times. He has never known how to deal with it. So he has either worshipped it or run away from it. They are both the same movement. My mind does not do either, nor does it use sorrow as a means of awakening. Then what takes place?

P: All other things are the products of our senses. Sorrow is more than that. It is a movement of the heart.

Krishnamurti: I am asking you what is the relationship between sorrow and love.

P: They are both movements of the heart.

Krishnamurti: What is love and what is sorrow?

P: Both are movements of the heart, the one is identified as joy and the other as pain.

Krishnamurti: Is love pleasure? Would you say joy and pleasure are the same? Without understanding the nature of pleasure, there is no depth to joy. You cannot invite joy. Joy happens. The happening can be turned into pleasure. When that pleasure is denied, there is the beginning of sorrow.

P: At one level it is so, but it is not so at another level.

Krishnamurti: As we said, joy is not a thing to be invited. It happens. Pleasure I can invite, pleasure I can pursue. If pleasure is love, then love can be cultivated.

P: We know pleasure is not love. Pleasure may be one manifestation of love but it is not love. Both sorrow and love emerge from the same source.

Krishnamurti: I asked what is the relationship between sorrow and love? Can there be love if there is sorrow - sorrow being all the things that we have talked about?

P: I would say "yes".

Krishnamurti: In sorrow, there is a factor of separation, of fragmentation. Is there not a great deal of self-pity in sorrow? What is the relationship of all this to love? Has love dependency? Has love the quality of the "me" and the "you"?

P: But you talked of passion.....

Krishnamurti: When there is no movement of escape from sorrow then love is. Passion is the flame of sorrow and that flame can only be awakened when there is no escape, no resistance. Which means what? - Which means, sorrow has in it no quality of

division.

P: In that sense, is that state of sorrow any different from the state of love? Sorrow is pain. You say when in that pain there is no resistance, no movement away from pain, the flame of passion emerges. Strangely in the ancient texts, kama (love), agni (fire), and yama (death) are said to be the same; they are placed on the same level; they are all identical; they create, purify and destroy to create again. There has to be an ending.

Krishnamurti: You see, that is just it. What is the relationship of a mind which has understood sorrow and therefore the ending of sorrow? What is the quality of the mind that is no longer afraid of ending, which is death?

When energy is not dissipated through escape, then that energy becomes the flame of passion. Compassion means passion for all. Compassion is passion for all.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 2 NEW DELHI 14TH DECEMBER 1970 'ALCHEMY AND MUTATION'**

Questioner P: I was considering whether it would be worthwhile to discuss the ancient Indian attitude to alchemy and mutation and to see whether the findings of alchemy have any relevance to what you are saying. It is significant that Nagarjuna, one of the great propounders of Buddhist thought, was himself an alchemist Master. The search of the alchemist in India was not directed so much to turning base metal into gold, as to an investigation into certain psychophysical and chemical processes in which, through mutation the body and mind could be made free of the ravages of time and the processes of decay. The field of investigation included mastery of breath, the partaking of an elixir brewed in the laboratory, a substance wherein mercury played a vital part, and a triggering of an explosion in consciousness. The action of the three leads to a mutation of body and mind. The symbolism used by the alchemist was sexual; mercury was the male seed of Shiva, mica the seed of the goddess; the union of the two, not only physically and in the crucibles of the laboratory but in consciousness itself, brought into being a mutation; a state that was free of time and the processes of ageing, a state that was unrelated to the two constituents that in total union had triggered the mutation. Has this any relevance to what you are saying?

Krishnamurti: You are asking about the state of consciousness which is out of time.

P: In every individual one can see the male and female element

in operation.

The alchemist saw the need of union, of balance. Is there any validity in this?

Krishnamurti: I think one can observe this in oneself. I have often observed that in each one of us there are the male and female elements. Either they are in perfect balance or in a state of imbalance. When there is this complete balance between the male and the female, then the physical organism never really falls ill; there may be superficial illness but deep within there is no disease which destroys the organism. This is probably what the ancients must have sought - identifying it with mercury and mica, the male and the female and through meditation, study, and perhaps through some form of medicine tried to bring about this perfect harmony. One can see very clearly in oneself the operation of the male and female going on. When one or the other gets exaggerated, the imbalance creates disease; not superficial ailments but disease at the depths. I have noticed personally within myself under different situations and climates, with different people who are aggressive, violent, the female takes over and becomes more prominent. This prominence, the other uses to assert himself. But when there is too much femininity around one, the male does not become aggressive but withdraws without any resistance.

S: What are the male and female elements?

Krishnamurti: The male is generally aggressive, violent, dominating and the female is the quiet, which is taken for submissiveness and then exploited by man. But submissiveness which is taken to be the quality of the female, is really gentleness which gradually conquers the other.

When the female and the male are in complete harmony, the quality of both changes. It is no longer male or female. It is something totally different, in relation to what is considered as male and female. The male and the female as the positive and negative because of their very nature are dualistic, whereas the complete balance, a harmony of the two has a different quality. May I say something? It is like the quality of the earth in which everything lives but is not of it. I have noticed this operating very often. When the whole mind withdraws from the physical and the environment, it is as though it is very far away; far away not in space and time, but a state which nothing can touch. This state is not an abstraction nor a withdrawal but an inward, absolute, non-being. When this perfect harmony takes place, because there is no conflict, it has its own vitality. It does not destroy the other. So conflict is not only in the outer but also in the inner and when this conflict completely comes to an end, there is a mutation which is not touched by time.

P: The alchemist called this the birth of Kumara, of the magical child - he who never grows old, he who is completely innocent.

Krishnamurti: It is very interesting - but alchemy has become synonymous with so much phony magic.

P: But the alchemists, the Masters who were known as rasa siddhas - the holders of the essence - maintained that what they described they had seen with their own eyes, that what they recorded was not from hearsay nor from the dictation of a teacher. There is another factor of interest. A great deal of attention was paid in alchemy to the instrument, the vessel. The science of metallurgy developed out of this - one of the vessels or yantras was

known as the garbha yantra, the womb vessel. It is a key word in alchemy.

Is there such a thing as preparing the womb of the mind? in which time is involved.

P: The alchemists were also conscious that at the point of mutation, of the fixation of mercury, of the birth of the timeless, time was not involved.

Krishnamurti: Do not use the word preparation. Let us put it this way. Is there a necessary state, a necessary background, a necessary vessel which can contain this? I should say no, because when they found the boy Krishnamurti, the people who were supposedly clairvoyant for the time being, saw that he had no quality of selfishness and therefore he was worthy of being the vessel and I think that has remained right through.

S: That may be so, but what about ordinary people like us? Is this a privilege given only to a very very few, one in a thousand years or more, or can this happen to people who are concerned with all this, who are committed to all this, who are really serious in this enquiry?

Krishnamurti: To answer this question certain physical factors and psychological states are necessary. Physically there must be sensitivity. Physical sensitivity cannot possibly take place when there is smoking, drinking, eating meat. The sensitivity of the body must be maintained. That is absolutely essential. Traditionally such a body generally remains in one place supported by disciples, by the family. The body is not shocked or exposed.

Can a man who is very serious in all this, can he with a body which has gone through the normal brutalizing effects, can he

make that body highly sensitive? And also the psyche that has been wounded through experience, can it throw off all the wounds and marks and renew itself so that there is a state in which there is no hurt? These two are essential - sensitivity and the psyche not having a mark. I think this can be achieved by any person who is really serious.

You see the womb is always ready to conceive. It renews itself.

P: Like the earth, the womb has that inbuilt quality of renewal.

Krishnamurti: I think the mind has exactly the same quality.

P: The earth is dormant, the womb is quiet and in both there is this inbuilt capacity for renewal.

Krishnamurti: The earth, the womb and the mind are of the same quality. When the earth lies fallow and the womb is empty and the mind without any movement, then renewal takes place. When the mind is completely empty, it is like the womb; it is pure to renew, receive.

P: This then is the vessel, the receptacle.

Krishnamurti: Yes, this is the vessel, but when you use the word vessel and receptacle, you must be exceedingly careful.

This inbuilt quality of the mind to renew itself can be called eternal youth.

P: It is known as kumara vidya.

Krishnamurti: So what makes the mind old? Obviously the movement of the self makes the mind old.

P: Does the self wear away the cells?

Krishnamurti: The womb is always ready to receive. It has a quality of purifying itself all the time, but the mind which is burdened with the self - friction is self - has no space to renew



itself. When the self is so occupied with itself and its activities, the mind has no space in which to renew itself. So space is necessary, both for the physical and the psyche. How does this go with alchemy? P: The language they use is different. They talk of mutation through union.

Krishnamurti: All that implies effort, friction.

P: How does one know?

Krishnamurti: If it implies any form of process, any form of achievement, it implies effort.

# **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 3**

## **NEW DELHI 15TH DECEMBER 1970 'THE CONTAINMENT OF EVIL'**

Questioner P: One of the most vital problems that has concerned man is the necessity of containing evil. It appears as if at certain times in history, because of various circumstances, evil has had a wider field within which to operate. The manifestations of evil are so wide, the problems of evil so complex that the individual does not know how to deal with them.

What would you say is the way of dealing with evil? Is there such a thing as evil independent of good?

Krishnamurti: I wonder what you mean. The bush with so many thorns - do you call that evil? Do you call a serpent with poison, evil? No savage animal is evil - neither the shark nor the tiger.

So what do you mean by the word evil? Something harmful? Something that can bring tremendous grief, something that can bring great pain, something that can destroy or prevent the light of understanding? Would you call war evil? Would you call the generals, the rulers, the admirals evil because they help to bring about war, destruction?

P: That which thwarts the nature of things can be called evil.

Krishnamurti: Man is brutal, is he evil?

P: If he is thwarting, if he through malignant intention makes certain things deviate....

Krishnamurti: I was just wondering what that word evil means. What does evil mean to an intelligent mind; a mind that is aware of all the horrors in the world?

P: Evil is that which diminishes consciousness, that which brings darkness.

Krishnamurti: Fear, sorrow, pain do that. Would you say that evil is the encouragement of fear? Is evil a means to further sorrow? Is evil social or environmental conditioning which perpetuates war? All these limit consciousness and create darkness and sorrow. Evil, according to the Christian idea, is the devil. Does the Hindu have any idea of evil? If he has an idea of evil, what would it be? Personally I never think of evil.

Would you say that in the flowering of goodness, there is no evil at all? That this state does not know evil? Or is evil an invention of the mind which breeds fear and creates the good? P: May I say something? If you go deep down into the recesses of the human mind, into the history of mankind, there has always been the sorcerer, the witch who subverts the laws of nature, who brings fear and darkness. It is one of the strangest elements in the human mind. It is because of this terrible fear of the unknown, that darkness without limit, without end, that prevails through the history of man, that the human being has cried out for protection; a cry that echoes through human consciousness. It is this which is the unknown, un-named matrix of fear. It is not enough to suggest that it is fear. It is all that and more.

Krishnamurti: Are you saying that deep in man, in the inner recesses of the mind, there is the fear of the unknown, of something that man cannot touch or imagine? Being afraid so deeply, he demands protection of the gods and anything that brings an awakening of that danger, any intimation of that hidden thing, he calls evil?

P: This darkness exists deep in human consciousness all the time.

Krishnamurti: Is evil the opposite of the good, or is it totally dependent of the good?

P: It is independent of the good.

Krishnamurti: You are saying it is independent. So, is evil something that is in itself unrelated to the beautiful, to love? Against evil, man has always sought protection, as he would against an animal. There is this hidden dark danger. Man is aware of it, he is frightened and seeks through incantations, rituals, prayers and so on to put it away and be guarded. The bush that is so full of thorns protects itself against the animal and the animal would call that evil as it cannot get at the leaves. Is there such a force, such an embodiment of evil which is totally apart from the good, the beautiful? There is this whole idea that evil is fighting good. This evil is seen as embodied in people and evil is always fighting the good and the gentle. I am asking, is evil totally independent of the good? You must be very careful not to become superstitious.

P: "Fear" of something is opposed to goodness. But the darkest fears are not "of anything".

S: It is not only protection and fear and the fear involved in evil, but protection in order to move forward.

P: The demand for protection, the mantras as spells, the mandalas as magical diagrams and the mudras as magical gestures were intended to provide protection against evil.

Krishnamurti: You see when you go deeply into consciousness, you reach a point where the unknown appears as the dark, and

there you stop, because you get frightened. The mind penetrates deeply up to a point, and below that point there is this feeling of dark emptiness. Because of the darkness, you have prayers, incantations, and because of the fear of the dark, you ask for protection. Can the mind go through the darkness, which means can the mind not be afraid? Can it operate so that the darkness becomes light? Can you penetrate the darkness of which you are afraid, which you have named "evil"? Can you penetrate that so completely that darkness does not exist? Then, what is evil?

P: When the ritual mandala is drawn, the entry into the mandala is through spell and mudra. In this entry into the darkness, what is the spell which will open the gates?

Krishnamurti: Consciousness as thought, investigates itself - its depth. As it enters it comes upon this darkness. This investigation is not a process of time. And you are asking what is the spell or energy that will penetrate to the very bottom of the darkness, what is that energy and how is it to come into being?

The very energy which started investigating is still there, more heavy, vital as it enters, penetrates. Why do you ask whether there is need of greater energy?

P: Because energy dries up. We penetrate up to a point and do not go further.

Krishnamurti: Because of fear, because of apprehension of something we do not know, we dissipate energy instead of bringing it into focus. I want to penetrate into myself. I see entering into myself is the same movement as the outer. It is entering into space. In entering into space, there is a certain demand, a certain energy. That energy must be without any effort, without any distortion. As

it enters, it gathers momentum. If it has no passage through which it can escape, it is not distorted. It becomes deeper, wider, stronger. Then you reach a point where there is darkness. And how does one enter that darkness with this tremendous energy? (pause)

P: The first question with which we started was how is evil to be contained. You have said as one penetrates the sea of darkness, darkness is not; light is. But when there is evil in human beings, in certain situations, in certain happenings, is there any action which can contain this evil?

Krishnamurti: I would not put it that way. Resistance to evil strengthens evil. So, if the mind is living in goodness, then there is no resistance and evil cannot touch it. Therefore there is no containing of evil.

P: Is there only goodness then?

Krishnamurti: We have to go back to something else - the mind has gone into darkness and it is finished with darkness. But is there evil which is independent of all that? Or is evil part of goodness?

You see in nature there is the big living on the little, the bigger on the big. I would not call that evil. The deliberate desire to hurt another; is that part of evil? I want to hurt another; is that part of evil? I want to hurt you because you have done something to me; is that evil?

P: That is part of evil.

Krishnamurti: Then that implies will. You hurt me, and, because I am proud, I want to retaliate. Wanting to retaliate is an action of will. Whether it is the will to react or to do good, both are evil.

P: Again coming back to the mandala; evil can enter when the

gateways are not protected. Here, your eyes and ears are the gateways.

Krishnamurti: So you are saying when the eyes see clearly, ears hear clearly, then evil cannot enter.

To go back, the deliberate intention, the collection of intentions, the thinking it over, which is all the deep intention to hurt, is part of will. I think that is where evil is - the deliberate act to hurt. You hurt me, I hurt you; I apologize and it is finished. But if I hold, retain, strengthen deliberately, follow a policy to hurt you, which is part of the will in man to do harm or good, then there is evil.

So is there a way of living without will? The moment I resist, evil must be on one side, and the good on the other and there is relationship between the two. When there is no resistance, there is no relationship between the two. And love then is an open space, without any words, without any resistance. Love is action out of emptiness. As we had been discussing yesterday, when the male elements deliberately become assertive, demanding, possessive, dominating, man invites evil. And the female, yielding, yielding, yielding and deliberately yielding in order to dominate, also invites evil.

So, where there is the cunning pursuit of domination, which is the operation of will, there is the beginning of evil.

You see against that evil we try to protect ourselves. We are ourselves creating evil and yet we draw a circle a diagram round the doorstep of the house to seek protection from evil, and inwardly the serpent of evil is operating.

Keep your house clean. Forget all the mantras; nothing can touch you.

We ask protection of the gods whom we have created. It is really quite fantastic.

All these wars, all the racial hatreds, all the accumulated hatreds which man has been storing up, that must have a collected hatred, a gathered evil. The Hitlers, the Mussolinis, the Stalins, the concentration camps, the Atilas; all that must be stored, must have a body somewhere.

So also, the feeling of "do not kill, be kind, be gentle, be compassionate" - that also must be stored somewhere.

When people try to protect themselves against the one, the evil, they are protecting themselves against the good too, because man has created these two. So, can the mind enter into darkness and the very entrance into it, is the dispelling of darkness?



## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 4 NEW DELHI 16TH DECEMBER 1970 'THE AWAKENING OF ENERGY'**

Questioner P: You have said when we were discussing Tantra, that there is a way of awakening energy. The Tantrics concentrate on certain psychic centres, and thereby release the dormant energy in those centres. Would you say there is any validity in this? What is the way of awakening energy?

Krishnamurti: What you said just now, concentrating on the various physio-psychical centres, implies, does it not, a process of time? So I would like to ask, can that energy be awakened without a process of time?

P: In this whole process, the traditional way demands correct posture and an equilibrium of breath. If the body does not know how to sit erect, and how to breathe rightly, there can be no ending of thought. To bring body and breath to an equilibrium, a process of time becomes inevitable.

Krishnamurti: There may be a totally different approach to this problem. Tradition starts from the psychosomatic, the posture, the breath control and gradually through various forms of concentration to the full awakening of energy. That is the accepted way. Is there not an awakening of this energy without going through all these practices?

P: It is like the Zen-Masters who say the real master is one who puts aside effort, and yet in Zen to master archery a tremendous mastery over technique is necessary. It is only when there is total mastery that effort drops away.

Krishnamurti: You are beginning at this end rather than at the other - this end being time, control, energy, perfection, perfect balance.

All this seems to me like dealing with a very small part of a very vast field. Tradition gives great importance to the past, to breathing, to the right posture. All these are limited to a corner of the field and through that corner you hope to have enlightenment. The corner then becomes a trick. Through some kind of psychosomatic acrobatics, it is hoped that you will capture the light, the whole universe. I do not think enlightenment is there - not through one corner. It is like seeing the sky through a small window and never going outside to look at the sky. I feel that way is an absurd way of approaching something totally vast, timeless.

P: Even you would admit that correct posture and right breathing strengthen the structure of the mind. Krishnamurti: I want to approach all this quite differently. In approaching it entirely differently, it is necessary to throw out all that has been said. I see the corner is like a candle in sunshine. The candle is being lit very carefully in brilliant sunshine. You are not concerned with sunshine, but work away at lighting the candle.

There are other things involved; there is the awakening of energy which has been dissipated so far.

To centralize energy, to gather the whole of it, attention is involved, and the elimination of time altogether.

I think there are these major factors - time, attention which is not forced, which is not concentration, which is not centred round a part, and the gathering of energy. I think these are the fundamental things one has to understand because enlightenment must be and is

the comprehension and understanding of this vast life - life being living, dying, loving; the whole travail and going beyond it.

The traditional Masters would also agree that you have to have attention to go beyond time. But they are the worshippers of the corner. They use time to go beyond time.

P: How Sir? I take a posture and direct my attention. What is the time involved in this?

Krishnamurti: Is attention the result of time?

P: No. You ask a question and there is immediate attention. Is this attention the product of time?

Krishnamurti: No, certainly not.

P: Your question and my attention being there, is there time involved? If you would regard this as so, the self-knowing process which is going on all the time also involves time. My mind twenty years ago would not have known the present quality. This state had no existence then.

Krishnamurti: Let us go slowly. We are trying to understand something which is out of time.

P: The tradition says prepare the body and mind.

Krishnamurti: Through time you prepare the body and mind to receive, to comprehend, to be free of time. Through time can you do this?

P: The tradition also posits that through time you cannot go beyond time.

Krishnamurti: I am asking, when you say through time you perfect the instrument, is it so? I question that. Through time can you perfect the instrument? Now first of all who is it that is perfecting the instrument? Is it thought?

P: It would be invalid to say only thought. There are many other factors involved.

Krishnamurti: Thought, the knowing of thought, intelligence, are all maintained by thought. To say thought must end and intelligence must come into being is again an action of thought. The statement, thinker and thought are one, is again an action of thought. You are saying perfect the instrument through thought. To me the traditional approach to perfect the instrument through thought and so to go beyond, and the act of cultivating intelligence and the going beyond time - all these are still in the area of thought. That is so. Therefore in that very thought there is the thinker. That thinker says this must happen, this must not happen. That thinker has become the will of achievement. The will to perfect the instrument is part of thought.

P: In this circle which you are talking; about, in that which you are describing just now, is also implied the questioning of the very instrument which is thought.

Krishnamurti: But the questioner is part of thought; the whole structure is part of thought. You can divide, subdivide, change, but it is all within the field of thought, and that is time. Thought is memory, thought is material; the material is memory. We are still functioning within the area of the known and the man who is cultivating thought says he will go to the unknown through the known, perfect the known and get enlightenment. Again all this is thought.

P: If everything is thought, it must then be necessary to give birth to a new instrument.

Krishnamurti: When thought says it must become silent and

becomes silent it is still thought. What the traditionalists do is to work within the field of thought which is the corner of the field. But it is still the result of thought. Atman is the result of thought. The brahman to which man looks up, is the result of thought. The man who experienced it had nothing to do with thought. It just happened, whereas his disciples came along and said do this, do that. It is all within the field of thought.

P: Then there is no proceeding.

Krishnamurti: See how thought plays tricks upon itself - I must have balance, I must have the right posture in order that the life energy flows through. Right? I say thought is of the past. Thought can create the most marvellous instrument - it can go to the moon, to Venus; but thought can never possibly touch "the other" because thought is never free, thought is old, thought is conditioned. Thought is the whole structure of the known.

P: What do you mean by "the other"?

Krishnamurti: That is not it.

P: That is not what?

Krishnamurti: This is within the field of time; thought which is time. That is within the field of silence. Therefore find out if sorrow can end. Come out of the corner. Find out what life is, what death means, what it means to end sorrow. If you have not come upon this, playing tricks upon thought has no meaning. You can awaken all the kundalinis, but to what purpose?

Therefore a man teaching how to awaken the kundalinis or making man proficient in archery in the Zen way or in the practice of the various forms of Tantra are all within the bondage of time, which is thought. I see that and I see that it is going round in

circles. The circle may be higher but it is still a circle, a bondage, which is time.

So I would not touch it. I would not touch it because I see the nature, structure and order of this corner. The corner has no meaning to me. When there is the marvellous sun, all the siddhis and powers are like many candles.

Can the mind, listening to this, wipe it away? The very listening is the wiping away. Then you have it. Then there is attention, love; everything is there. You see, logically, this holds whereas the other does not. The exercise of the brain is to find the truth and the false; to see the false as the false. You see when the boy Krishnamurti saw the truth, it was over. He gave up all organizations, etc. He had no training "to see".

P: But you had training. You were put through a vigorous training of the body.

Krishnamurti: So they tell us. Because the body was neglected. And so they said if he was not looked after he would fall ill.

P: But Sir, apart from physical discipline, there were instructions as to how to bring up that boy.

Krishnamurti: It was like combing the hair, doing asanas, pranayama; it was all at that level.

B: It is very subtle. I am not saying that what happened had any relationship to the illumination, but it is necessary to look after the body.

Krishnamurti: Yes, it is necessary to keep the body healthy.

P: Sir, if I may say so, you have the way of the yogi, you look like a yogi, your body takes the pose of a yogi. You have been doing asanas, pranayama, every day for so many years. Why?

Krishnamurti: That is not important. It is like keeping my nails clean. I am saying the other is so childish; spending years in perfecting the instrument. All that you have to do is "to look".

P: But if one is born blind, only when a person like you comes and says, look, something happens. Most people would not understand what you are talking about.

Krishnamurti: Most people would not listen to all this. They would brush it aside.

B: The other is easier. It gives something whereas this gives nothing.

Krishnamurti: This gives everything if you touch it.

B: But the other is easier.

Krishnamurti: You see I am terribly interested in this. How has the mind of Krishnamurti maintained this state of innocence?

P: What you are saying is not relevant. You may be an exception. How did the boy Krishnamurti come to it? He had money, organization, everything and yet he left everything. If I were to take my grand-daughter and leave her with you and she had no other companion but you, even then she would not have it.

Krishnamurti: No, she would not have it. (pause) Wipe out all this. P: When you say that, it is like the Zen koan; the goose being out of the bottle. Did you have a centre to wipe away?

Krishnamurti: No.

P: So you had no centre to wipe away? You are unique and therefore you are a phenomenon, and so you cannot tell us you did this and so it happened. You can only tell us "This is not it" and whether we drown or not, no one else can tell us. We see this. We may not be enlightened, but we are not unenlightened.

Krishnamurti: I think it is tremendously interesting - to see that anything that thought touches is not the real. Thought is time. Thought is memory. Thought cannot touch the real.



## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 5 NEW DELHI 19TH DECEMBER 1970 'THE FIRST STEP IS THE LAST STEP'**

Questioner P: Yesterday, while you were on a walk, you said the first step is the last step. To understand that statement, I think we should investigate the problem of time and whether there is such a thing as a final state of enlightenment. The confusion arises because our minds are conditioned to think of illumination as the final state. Is understanding or illumination a final state?

Krishnamurti: You know, when we said that the first step is the last step, were we not thinking of time as a horizontal or a vertical movement? Were we not thinking of movement along a plane? We were saying yesterday, when we were walking, if we could put aside height, the vertical and the horizontal altogether, and observe this fact that wherever we are, at whatever level of conditioning, of being, the perceiving of truth, of the fact, is at that moment the last step.

I am a clerk in a little office, with all the misery involved in it; the clerk listens and perceives. The man listens and at that moment really sees. That seeing and that perception is the first and the last step. Because, at that moment he has touched truth and he sees something very clearly.

But what happens afterwards is that he wants to cultivate that state. The perception, the liberation and the very perception bringing about liberation; he wants to perpetuate, to turn it into a process. And therefore he gets caught and loses the quality of perception entirely.

So, what we are saying is that any process involves finality. It is a movement from the horizontal to the vertical; the vertical leading to a finality. And therefore we think that perception, liberation is a finality; a point which has no movement. After all, the methods, the practices, the systems imply a process towards a finality.

If there were no conceptual idea of finality, there would be no process.

P: The whole structure of thought is built on a horizontal movement and therefore any postulation of eternity has to be on the horizontal plane.

Krishnamurti: We are used to reading a book horizontally. Everything is horizontal - all our books.

P: Everything has a beginning and an ending.

Krishnamurti: And we think the first chapter must inevitably lead to the last chapter. We feel all the practices lead to a finality; to an unfoldment. It is all horizontal reading. Our minds, eyes and attitudes are conditioned to function on the horizontal and at the end, there is a finality. The book is over. You ask if truth or enlightenment is a final achievement; a final point beyond which there is nothing?

P: From which there can be no slipping back. I might for an instant perceive, and the quality of that, I understand. A little later, thought arises again. I say to myself "I am back in the old state". I question whether that "touching" had any validity at all. I put a distance, a block between myself and that state - I say, if that were true, thought would not arise.

Krishnamurti: I see; I perceive something that is extraordinary; something that is true. I want to perpetuate that perception; give it

a continuity so that perception - action continues throughout my daily life. I think that is where the mistake lies. The mind has seen something true. That is enough. That mind is a clear, innocent mind, which has not been hurt. Thought wants to carry on that perception through the daily acts. The mind has seen something very clearly. Leave it there. The next step is the final step. The leaving of it is the next final step. Because my mind is already fresh to take the next final step. In the daily movement of life, it does not carry over. The perception has not become knowledge.

P: The self as the doer in relation to thought or seeing has to cease.

Krishnamurti: Die to the thing that is true. Otherwise it becomes memory, which then becomes thought, and thought says how am I to perpetuate that state. If the mind sees clearly, and it can only see clearly when the seeing is the ending of it, then the mind can start a movement where the first step is the last step. In this there is no process involved at all. There is no element of time. Time enters when, having seen it clearly, having perceived it, there is a carrying over and the applying of it to the next incident.

P: The carrying over is the not seeing or perceiving.

Krishnamurti: So, all the traditional approaches which offer a process must have a point, a conclusion, a finality and anything that has a finality, a final point, is not a living thing at all.

It is like saying there are many roads to the station. The station is fixed.

Is truth a finality that once you have achieved it, everything is over - your anxieties, your fears and so on? Or does it work totally differently? Does it mean that once I am on the train, nothing can

happen to me? Does it mean that I expect the train will carry me to my destination? All these are horizontal movements.

So a process implies a fixed point. Systems, methods, practices all offer a fixed point and promise man that when he achieves it, all his troubles are over. Is there something which is really timeless? A fixed point is in time. It is in time because you have postulated it. Because there has been thinking over of the final point, and the thinking of it is time. Can one come upon this thing which must have no time, no process, no system, no method, no way?

Can this mind which is so conditioned horizontally, can this mind, knowing that it lives horizontally, perceive that which is neither horizontal nor vertical? Can it perceive for an instant?

Can it perceive that the seeing has cleansed and end it?

In this is the first and the last step because it has seen anew.

Your question is, is such a mind ever free of trouble? I think it is a wrong question. You are still thinking in terms of finality, when you put that question. You have already come to a conclusion, and so are back again into the horizontal process.

P: The subtlety of it is that the mind has to ask fundamental questions but never the "how".

Krishnamurti: Absolutely. I see very clearly; I perceive. Perception is light. I want to carry it over as memory, as thought, and apply it to daily living and therefore I introduce duality, conflict, contradiction.

So I say how am I to go beyond it? All systems offer a process, a fixed point and the ending of all trouble.

Perceiving is light to this mind. It is not concerned with perception any more because if it is concerned, it becomes

memory. Can the mind, seeing something very clearly, end that perception? Then, here the very first step is the last step. The mind is fresh to look. To such a mind, is there an end to all troubles? It does not ask such a question. When it happens, it will see. See what takes place. When I ask the question "Will this end all trouble?" I am already thinking of the future and therefore I am caught in time.

But I am not concerned. I perceive. It is over. I see something very clearly - the clarity of perception. Perception is light. It is over. Therefore the mind is never caught in time. Because I have taken the first step, I have also taken the last step each time.

So we see that all the processes, all the systems, must be totally denied because they perpetuate time. Through time you hope to arrive at the timeless.

P: I see that the instruments used in what you are saying are the fact of seeing and listening. These are sensory movements. It is through sensory movements that conditioning also comes into being. What is it that makes one movement totally dissolve conditioning and another to strengthen it?

Krishnamurti: How do I listen to that question? First of all, I do not know. I am going to learn. If I learn in order to acquire knowledge, from which I am going to act, that action becomes mechanical. But when I learn without accumulating - which means perceiving, hearing, without acquiring - the mind is always empty. Then what is the question?

Can the mind which is empty ever be conditioned and why does it get conditioned? A mind which is really listening, can it ever be conditioned? It is always learning, it is always in movement. It is

not a movement from something towards something. A movement cannot have a beginning and an ending. It is something which is alive, never conditioned. A mind that acquires knowledge to function is conditioned by its own knowledge.

P: Is it the same instrument which is operating in both?

Krishnamurti: I do not know. I really do not know. The mind which is crowded with knowledge sees according to that knowledge, according to that conditioning.

P: Sir, seeing is like switching on light. It has no conditioning in itself.

Krishnamurti: The mind is full of images, words, symbols. Through that, it thinks, it sees.

P: Does it see?

Krishnamurti: No. I have an image of you and I look through that image. That is distortion. The image is my conditioning. It is still the same vessel with all the things in it, and it is the same vessel which has nothing in it.

The content of the vessel is the vessel. When there is no content, the vessel has no form.

P: So it can receive "what is".

Krishnamurti: Perception is only possible when there is no image. That is very simple. You see, to go back, perception is only possible when there is no image - no symbol, no idea, word, form, which are all the image. Then perception is light. It is not that I see light. There is light. Perception is light. So perception is action. And a mind which is full of images cannot perceive. It sees through images and so is distorted.

What we have said is true. It is logically so. I have listened to

this. In the factor of listening there is no "I". In the factor of carrying it over, there is the "I". The "I" is time'

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 6 NEW DELHI 21ST DECEMBER 1970 'ENERGY AND TRANSFORMATION'**

Questioner P: Science and yoga both maintain that when a living organism is exposed to tremendous energy there is a mutation. This happens when there is excessive exposure to radiation - it may lead to a mutation in the genes. It also happens according to yoga, when thought is placed in consciousness before the fire of energy. Do you think this has meaning in terms of what you are teaching?

B: Radiation brings deformity. There can be destructive mutation. A laser beam pierces steel and flesh. It has the power to destroy as well as to heal.

Krishnamurti: What would you say is human energy? What is energy in human beings? Let us keep it very simple.

P: Energy is that which makes movement possible.

B: Energy is at different levels. There is the energy at the physical level. Then the brain itself is a source of energy; it sends out electrical impulses.

Krishnamurti: All movement, radiation, any movement of thought, any action is energy. When does it become intense? When can it do the most astonishing things? When can it be directed to do incredible things?

P: When it is not dissipated. When it is brought into focus.

Krishnamurti: When does that happen? Does it happen in anger, hatred, violence? Does it happen when there is ambition, when there is tremendous desire? Or does it happen when a poet has the urge, the vitality, the energy to write?



P: Such energy crystallizes and becomes static.

Krishnamurti: We know this form of energy. But the energy we know does not bring about a change in the human mind. Why? This energy becomes intense when there is fulfilment in action. When does it move to a different dimension? An artist or a scientist, using his talent, intensifies energy and gives expression to it. But the quality of his mind, of his being, is not transformed by this energy.

P. We are missing something in all this.

Krishnamurti: You are asking whether there is a quality of energy which transforms the human mind? That is your question. Now, why does it not take place in the artist, in the musician, in the writer? P.: I think it is because their energy is one-dimensional.

Krishnamurti: The artist still remains ambitious, greedy, a bourgeois.

S: Why do you say that greed would come in the way of energy operating? Man may be ambitious but he is also good. These are the elements which structure his self.

Krishnamurti: We are asking why, when man has that energy, that energy does not bring about a radical change?

P: Man has energy to operate in his environment. But there are large areas of his being where there is no movement of energy.

Krishnamurti: Man uses energy, operates fully in one direction, and in the other he is dormant. Energy is dormant in one part of his existence, and in the other part it is active.

P: Even man's sensory instruments are utilized partially.

Krishnamurti: He is a fragmentary human being. Why does this division take place? One fragment is tremendously active, the other

does not function at all. One fragment is ordinary, bourgeois, petty. When do these two fragments coalesce to become harmonious energy? An energy which is not fragmented? An energy which does not function fully at one level while at another level its voltage is low?,

P: When the sensory instruments operate fully.

Krishnamurti: When does this take place? Do they operate completely when there is a tremendous crisis?

P: Not always, Sir. The action of crisis can also be partial; you can jump when you see a snake but you can jump into a bush of thorns.

Krishnamurti: When does the fragment cease to be a fragment? Are we not thinking in terms of movement, in terms of action, in terms of change? We have accepted the movement to be, the movement of becoming. We have accepted fragmentation. The movement of becoming is always a movement in fragments. Is there a movement which does not belong to these categories? See what happens if there is no movement at all.

P: I have always found it difficult to understand this question of yours. The nature of the very question suggests the other, the opposite.

S: One really does not know the dormant movement.

Krishnamurti: At the beginning we said there was fragmentation. One fragment is very alive and the other is not alive.

B: The energy of the artist, the whole of his being, operates one-dimensionally. There is non-awareness.

Krishnamurti: I am not at all sure. One fragment is alive. You

are saying the other fragment is not aware of itself at all.

P: The artist paints, he also has an affair with a woman. He does not see these actions as fragments.

Krishnamurti: We have gone beyond that. We see he is fragmented. He operates in fragments - one is active and the other is dormant. In that dormancy there is action going on. One is very active and the other is action in a minor key. We see this.

Now the question is, can this energy heighten to bring about a mutation in the brain cells?

P: Can it take the sluggish part along and alter its very structure so that there is a transformation in both?

Krishnamurti: I may be a great sculptor. A part of me is dormant. You ask, can there be a mutation not only in the dormant but also in that energy which goes into the making of the sculptor?

The question is, am I willing to accept that I may cease to be a sculptor? Because that may happen. When I go into this problem of a change in the very brain cells themselves, it is possible I may never be a sculptor. But it is very important for me to be a sculptor. I do not want to let that go.

P: Let us leave the sculptor. Here we are in front of you and you say, look, this change in the structure of the brain cells may be the ending of all the talent, of all significant action. We accept what you say.

Krishnamurti: That is right. If you are prepared to let go, then what takes place? Which means, you let go the talent, the fulfilment, the perpetuation of the "me". Now when does this mutation in the brain cells through energy take place?

You see, where energy is being dissipated through talent and

through other channels, energy is not completely held. When this energy has no movement at all, then I think something happens, then it must explode.

I think then the quality of the brain-cell itself changes. That is why I asked why we are always thinking in terms of movement?

When there is no movement inwardly or outwardly, when there is no demand for experience, no awakening, no seeking, no movement of any kind, then energy is at its height. Which means, one must negate all movement. When that takes place, energy is completely quiet, which is silence.

As we said the other day, when there is silence, then the mind is transforming itself. When it is completely fallow, when nobody is cultivating it, then it is quiet like the womb.

The mind which is the vessel of movement, when that movement has no form, no "me", no vision, no image, it is completely quiet.

In it there is no memory. Then the brain cells undergo a change.

The brain cells are used to movement in time. They are the residue of time and time is movement; a movement within the space which it creates as it moves. When the mind sees this, when it sees the futility of all movement in the sense of time, then all movement ends.

So when the mind denies totally all movement, therefore all time, all thought, all memory, there is absolute quietness, not relative quietness.

Therefore, the question is not how to bring about mutation, but to enquire into the structure of the brain cells. The realization that any movement from the brain cells gives continuity to time itself,

puts an end to all movement. Movement is always in the past or in the future - movement from the past through the present to the future. That is all we know and we want change in this movement. We want the movement, and yet we want change in this movement, and therefore the brain cells continue. (Pause)

It is amazingly simple. I do not know if you see this. We all want to complicate it. Any effort to stop movement is contradiction and therefore, time, and therefore no change at all. The seekers have all talked of a higher movement, the hierarchical movement. The question is, can the mind deny to itself all movement?

You see, as you watch your brain, there is the centre which is completely quiet and yet listening to everything that is going on - the bus, the birds. We want to stop the noise outside but keep on with the inner noise. We want to stop outer movement but carry on with the inner movement.

When there is no movement, there is tremendous focus of energy.

So mutation is the understanding of movement and the ending of movement in the brain cells themselves.

# **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 7**

## **NEW DELHI 25TH DECEMBER 1970 'THE OBSERVER AND "WHAT IS"'**

Questioner P: The problem of duality and its ending cannot be understood unless we go into the nature of the thinker and thought. Can we discuss this?

Krishnamurti: How do the Hindu thinkers, the Advaita philosophers deal with this problem?

P: Patanjali's Yoga-sutras postulate a state of liberation which has anchors, and a state of liberation which is without anchors. In the one, the thinker is the prop; it is a state where the thinker has not ceased. In the other, there is a state where everything including the thinker has ceased.

The Buddhist talk of kshana vada, time as instant, total and complete in itself where the thinker has no continuity. The Advaita philosophers talk of the cessation of duality and the attainment of non-duality. They go through a dualistic process to attain this non-dual state. Sankara approaches this state of non-duality through negation (neti, neti). Nagarjuna, the Buddhist philosopher's negation is absolute; if you say there is God, he negates it; if you say there is no God, he negates it. Every statement is negated.

B: Buddha says what exists is the "Solitude of Reality". You are the result of your thoughts.

P: They have all talked about non-duality - the Buddha, Sankara, Nagarjuna. But non-duality has become a concept. It has not affected the structure of the mind itself. In India for centuries the negative approach has been discussed, but it has not affected

the human mind. The brain cells have remained dualistic; they operate in time and are caught in time. Though negation and the non-dual have been posited, there is no clue to apprehend these states. Why has non-duality not affected the mind of man? Can we go into it to see whether we can discover that which will trigger the non-dual state?

B: All other developments - scientific, technological - have affected the minds of people. Man has discovered the non-dualistic state but it has not affected his mind nor his life.

S: If every experience leaves a mark on the brain cells, what is the impact of the state of non-duality, of oneness? Why is a mutation not taking place in the relationship between the thinker and the thought?

P: Is the mechanism which records the technological, the same mechanism which "sees, perceives"?

Krishnamurti: The technological cell, the recording cell and the perceptive cell -

P: And they seem to form the "ego".

Krishnamurti: The technological and the recording fragment - these two make up the ego. Not the perceptive.

P: I am including "perceiving" also. The recording is concerned with both - the technological and perception.

Krishnamurti: It may be a verbal explanation.

P: The core of man never seems to get affected. The basic essential duality between the thinker and thought continues.

Krishnamurti: Do you think there is basically a duality or only "what is", the fact?

P: When you, Sir, ask a question like that, the mind stands still

and one says "yes, it is so". Then the query starts - am I not separate from S, from B? Though the mind says "yes", it also queries a split second later. The moment you asked the question, my mind became still.

Krishnamurti: Why not stay there?

P: The query arises.

Krishnamurti: Why? Is it habit, tradition, the very nature of the operation of the self, the conditioning? All that may be due to the cultural imposition to survive, to function and so on. Why bring that in when we are looking at the fact - whether there is duality which is basic?

P: You say it may be a reflex action of the brain cells?

Krishnamurti: We are the result of our environment, of our society, We are the result of all our interactions. That is a fact also. I am asking myself is there a basic duality at the very core, or does duality arise when I move away from "what is"? When I do not move away from the basic non-dualistic quality of the mind, the thinker there, has he a duality? He thinks. Does the thinker create a duality when he is completely with "what is"?

I never think when I look at a tree. When I look at you, there is no division as the "me" and "you". Words are used for linguistic and communicative purposes. The "me" and "you" are somehow not rooted in me. So, where does the thinker arise separate from thought? Mind remains in "what is". It remains with pain. There is no thinking of non-pain. There is the sense of suffering. That is "what is". There is no feeling of wanting to be out of it. Where does duality arise? Duality arises when the mind says, "I must be rid of pain. I have known states of non-pain and I want to be in a



state of non-pain" (Pause). You are a man and I am a woman. That is a biological fact. But is there a psychological dualism? Is there a basically dualistic state or only when the mind moves away from "what is"?

There is sorrow. My son is dead. I do not move away. Where is the duality? It is only when I say I have lost my companion, my son, that duality comes into being. I wonder if this is right? I have pain - physical or psychological grief. They are all included in pain. A movement away from it, is duality. The thinker is the movement away. The thinker then says this should not be; he also says there should not be duality.

First see the fact that the movement away from "what is", is the movement of the thinker who brings in duality. In observing the fact of pain, why should there be a thinker in that observation? The thinker arises when there is a movement, either backwards or forwards. The thought that I had no pain yesterday - in that duality arises. Can the mind remain with the pain, without any movement away from it, which brings in the thinker?

The mind is asking itself how this dualistic attitude towards life arises? It is not asking for an explanation of how to go beyond it. I have had pleasure yesterday. It is finished. (Pause). Is it not as simple as that?

P: Not really.

Krishnamurti: I think it is. You see, this implies non-comparative observation. Comparison is dualistic. Measurement is dualistic. There is pain today, there is the comparison with the non-pain of tomorrow. But there is only one fact: the pain which the mind is going through now. Nothing else exists. Why have we

complicated this? Why have we built tremendous philosophies round all this? Are we missing something? Is it that the mind does not know what to do and therefore moves away from the fact and brings duality into being? If it knew, would it bring about duality? Is the "what to do" itself a dualistic process? Do you understand? Let us look at it again. There is pain - physical or psychological. When the mind does not know what to do in the non-dualistic sense, it escapes. Can the mind caught in the trap, the backward and the forward movement, can it deal with "what is" in a non-dualistic way? Do you understand? So we are asking, can pain, the "what is", be transformed without dualistic activity? Can there be a state of non-thinking, in which the thinker does not come into being at all; the thinker who says "I had no pain yesterday and I will not have it tomorrow"?

P: See what happens to us. What you say is right. But there is a lack of something within us; it may be strength, energy. When there is a crisis, the weight of that crisis is sufficient to plunge us into a state where there is no movement away from the crisis; but in everyday life, we have "little" challenges.

Krishnamurti: If you really understood this, you would meet these little challenges.

P: In everyday life, we have the chattering, erratic movement of the thinker operating with its demands. What does one do with that?

Krishnamurti: I do not think you can do anything with it. That is the denial. It is irrelevant.

P: But that is very very important. That is what our minds are - the erratic part. One does not have the capacity to negate that.

Krishnamurti: Listen, there is noise outside. I cannot do anything about it. P: When there is a crisis, there is contact. In normal living there is no contact. I go out. I can look at a tree and there is no duality. I can see colour without duality. But there is the other, the non-stopping, erratic no-sense part that is continuously chattering. The thinker starts operating on it when it sees it functioning. The great negation is to let it alone.

Krishnamurti: Settle the primary factor - to observe pain without moving away from it - that is the only non-dualistic state.

P: Let us speak of the chattering mind instead of pain, because that is the fact at this moment. The noise of that horn, the chattering mind, that is "what is".

Krishnamurti: You prefer this and do not prefer that and thereby begins the whole circle.

P: The central point is the observation of "what is" without moving away. The moving away creates the thinker.

Krishnamurti: Because the noise, the chattering which was the "what is", has gone, has faded away but the pain remains. Pain has not gone. To go beyond pain non-dualistically; that is the question. How is it to be done? Any movement away from "what is", is dualistic because in that there is the thinker operating on "what is", which is the dualistic.

Now can one observe "what is", which is the dualistic? To observe "what is", without the dualistic movement taking place, will that transform "what is"? Do you understand my question?

P: Is it not really a dissolution of "what is"? That which was created?

Krishnamurti: I know only "what is", nothing else. Not the

cause.

P: That is so. One can see that when there is no movement away from pain, there is a dissolution of pain.

Krishnamurti: How does this happen? Why has man not come to this? Why has he fought pain with a dualistic movement? Why has he never understood or delved into pain without the dualistic movement? What happens when there is no movement away from pain? Not what happens to the dissolution of pain but what happens to the mechanism that operates? It is simple. Pain is the movement away. There is no pain where there is only listening. There is pain only when I move from the fact and say this is pleasurable, this is not pleasurable. My son dies. That is an absolute, irrevocable fact. Why is there pain?

P: Because I loved him.

Krishnamurti: Look what has already happened unconsciously. I loved him. He has gone. The pain is the remembrance of my love for him. And he is no more. But the absolute fact is he is gone. Remain with that fact. There is pain only when I say he is no more, which is when the thinker comes into being and says, "my son is no longer there, he was my companion," and all the rest of it.

S: It is not merely the memory of my son who is dead which is pain. There is loneliness now.

Krishnamurti: My son is dead. That is a fact. Then there is the thought of loneliness. Then there is my identification with him. All that is a process of thought and the thinker. But I have only one fact. My son is gone, loneliness, the lack of companionship, despair, are all the result of thought, which creates duality; a movement away from "what is". It does not need strength or

determination not to move. The determination is dualistic.

There is only one thing, which is the fact and my movement away from the fact, from "what is". It is this that breeds bitterness, callousness, lack of love, indifference, which are all the product of thinking. The fact is my son is gone.

The complete non-perception of "what is" breeds the thinker, which is dualistic action; and when the mind falls again into the trap of dualistic action, that is "what is; remain with that - for any movement away from that is another dualistic action. The mind is always dealing with "what is" as noise, no noise. And "what is", the fact, needs no transformation because it is already "the beyond". Anger is "what is". The dualistic movement of non-anger is away from "what is". The non-movement from "what is", is no longer anger. Therefore, the mind - once it has perceived, once it has had non-dualistic perception - when anger arises again, does not act from memory. The next time anger arises, that is "what is". Mind is always dealing with "what is". Therefore, the dualistic concept is totally wrong, fallacious.

P: This is tremendous action. The dualistic action is non-action.

Krishnamurti: You have to be simple. It is the mind that is not clever, that is not cunning, that is not trying to find substitutes for dualistic action, that can understand. Our minds are not simple enough. Though we all talk of simplicity, that simplicity is of the loincloth.

The non-dual means really the art of listening. You hear that dog barking - listen to it, without a movement away from it. Remain with "what is". (Pause) The man who remains with "what is" and never moves away from it, has no marks.

P: And when marks take place, to see that they take place. One act of perception removes the mark.

Krishnamurti: Quite right. That is the way to live.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 8 NEW DELHI 26TH DECEMBER 1970 'THE BACKWARD FLOWING MOVEMENT'**

Questioner P: I would like to ask you about the backward flowing movement, a state in which there is a drawing in of sight, hearing and the energies of sex. In the Yoga-sutra, there is a word 'parivritti', which denotes the state where thought turns back upon itself. Is there such a state as the drawing in of the outward flowing senses and of thought turning back on itself?

Krishnamurti: Like a glove taken inside out? Are you saying that thought looking at itself, or swallowing itself, is the backward flowing movement?

P: What is meant by the word, the content of the word, is a matter of experience.

Krishnamurti: You are asking, is there a state in which hearing, seeing and the sensual energies draw themselves into one and there is a moving backwards? What do you mean by backwards?

Are you saying that the hearing, the seeing and the sensual energies are with drawing without outer propelling?

P: The normal movement of the eyes, ears and the sensual energies is an outer movement, linked with object. Can there be a freeing of the senses from object and a drawing-in of the senses?

Krishnamurti: I wonder if in the drawing in, the no hearing, no seeing and the sensual energy not expanding, there is not a state where there is the hearing of sound, the seeing everything and yet a state of total quiet, a state of being withdrawn, a state where there is no desire.

P: It is not suppression of desire.

Krishnamurti: Is there a state where there is the hearing of sound, the eyes seeing, objects existing, and yet there is no sensuous desire? I think there is such a state. A state where there is sensation, yet there is no desire. Not that one has become old, lost vitality but there is no desire - desire being the seeing, touching, sensation and out of that sensation, the wanting to possess.

P: What happens to the process of hearing when there is no naming?

Krishnamurti: Do you hear that siren? There is the vibration of sound and the interpretation that takes place when you hear the siren. Now can you listen to it without any movement of memory as thought? Can you hear only the sound? Can there be no image, no naming, no interpretation? Can there be only sound? That is all. And the sound is out of silence. Because the activity of thought has come to an end, there is a hearing of sound out of emptiness. And in the same way can there be a seeing out of emptiness? I see you, I see that bottle; there is no image, no association or movement of thought because there is no image formation. So out of real emptiness, quietness, there is a seeing. Is that what you mean by withdrawing the senses?

P: I am questioning out of the texts. In China and in India, the withdrawing was considered important.

Krishnamurti: It is simple. Are you asking, can you look at a woman or a man or a beautiful object without desire, fulfilment or reaction? It is easy.

P: It is easy for you. See our difficulty.

Krishnamurti: I see a beautiful woman, car, child, furniture and



so on. Can it be observed without any movement for acquiring or discarding? It is very simple. It is the same for seeing and listening.

I think they are one movement, not separate movements.

Though the instruments of perception and hearing are separate, they are all one movement.

P: Desire existed before God; even before man came into being. The biological urge, the impetus is based on desire. How can you take desire which has its own propelling force and say it has no existence?

Krishnamurti: Let us be clear. I see a beautiful car, a really beautiful car -

P: Let us say I fall passionately in love. I am torn, ravaged by that desire. Can I see that person without desire operating?

Krishnamurti: What is it you are trying to ask?

P: Is there an actual withdrawal of sensory perception?

Krishnamurti: I wonder if we mean the same thing?

P: The car and may be even the woman can be looked at without naming. But we are loaded with questions, with problems of naming. It is not simple.

Krishnamurti: I wonder if the problem of naming is not related to knowledge.

P: Sir, a child is not exposed to knowledge and yet naming is a natural reaction. I am questioning the nature of this inward movement.

Krishnamurti: I am not sure I understand what you are trying to say. There is withdrawing of sensory desires and fulfilment. Why do you use the word "inward"?

P: There are practices to delve deep. With eyes and ears closed,

you can delve deep inwardly. Is there any validity to delving?

Krishnamurti: Yes definitely.

What you call delving in is to shut your eyes, to shut your ears; in that state is there a delving or is there a cessation of all movement, which appears as though you were delving in? When you really close your eyes and ears, there is no movement within or without, as desire demanding fulfilment with all its frustrations; when that does not take place, there is complete quietness. The moment you use the word "delving in", that implies duality.

P: You hear that horn. To you is there no sound at all in it?

Krishnamurti: No.

P: It is quite extraordinary. To you there is no sound. When you close your ears, is there no inner sound, separate from you? We hear an inner sound, a volume of it which is within us. Do you not hear it? (Krishnamurti closes his eyes and ears.)

Krishnamurti: No. But one must be clear. When the eyes are closed, one generally sees spots. If one observes those spots, they disappear.

P: Is there not an expansion, a contraction?

Krishnamurti: Nothing. When I close my eyes, there is absolutely no movement of any kind.

P: That means your whole consciousness is different. When I close my eyes, so many patterns are there. To you there is no movement of sound or pattern.

Krishnamurti: That is why I want to go into this question of knowledge. This person has not read the Yoga-sutras and the religious books, and to him there is only a complete emptiness.

P: It is not because he has not read any religious books.

Krishnamurti: There is no interference of knowledge.

P: The same phenomenon will not happen to anyone who is ignorant of religious literature. It cannot happen to a communist.

Krishnamurti: It is knowledge as pattern that interferes. Pattern is created by knowledge, experience. When there is no retention of knowledge, then what is there? There is absolute quietness - eyes, ears and desire - no movement. Why do you make this out as something special? The man who is caught in association, idea, thoughts, in patterns, such a man does not have an empty mind.

P: What you say is valid. There are many times when what you say is valid within me.

Krishnamurti: My point is, those people who spoke of inward movement, were they aware of its dualistic nature?

P: They must have been aware. The Yoga-Sutras say that the seer is nothing more than the instrument of seeing. They make an absolute statement like that.

Krishnamurti: Probably the man who saw, perceived the reality said the seer and the seeing are one. Then the followers came along and made theories without experiencing the state.

I cannot separate the observer from the observed. When I close my eyes, there is no observer at all. Therefore, there is no inward movement as opposed to the outward movement.

P: Do you see yourself as a person?

Krishnamurti: If you mean the body - yes. As an ego, as a person talking on the platform, walking, climbing the hill - no.

P: The sense of existence, the sense of "I am"; does it operate in you? Krishnamurti: One of the things I have never had is the sense of the "I". Never.

P: "I exist" is the central core in all of us. It is the very fabric of our existence.

Krishnamurti: The peripheral expressions of Krishnamurti appear to be a person.

But at the centre there is no person. I really do not know what it means. You are asking, is there in you a centre, the "I am", the sense of "I am". No. The feeling of "I am" is not true.

P: It is not as obvious as that. But the sense of existence, the core of the ego within us, is unexplored. There is something which holds it together and as long as it remains, what you are saying - the no centre - has no validity for us.

Krishnamurti: There is no movement of the past as the "me" in the centre, in the person. One has to go into this very carefully. As we said the other day, the first step is the last step. The first perception is the last perception and the ending of the first perception is the new perception. Therefore, there is a total gap between the first perception and the second perception. In that interval, there is no movement of thought. There would be the movement of thought when the memory of the first perception remains, not when it is over. Can the mind not empty itself of every perception? Can it not die to every expression, and when it does, where is the root of the "I am"? When the mind is that, is there any movement of pattern taking place? When eyes, ears and desire are non-existent as movement towards or away from something, then why should the mind have any pattern? The seeing is the seer, in that there is no duality, but those who make that statement into an axiom do not experience it and therefore it remains a theory.

P: The Sutras say there are many types of liberation. Liberation is by birth. Some men are born that way. That is the highest form of liberation. Then there is liberation by drugs which is part of witchcraft; then liberation through the asanas, then liberation through breath control, then liberation by understanding.

I have always felt that you have never been able to explain to us how liberation happened to you.

Was your mind like ours and it underwent mutation? If so, then there is a possibility of seeing for oneself and transforming the self. But even that is not relevant. I see that another's seeing cannot help me to see. What I see is my own. One has to leave it there. One cannot probe further.

Krishnamurti: As you said, liberation is divided between those born liberated and those liberated through drugs, through yoga, through breath control and understanding. These are just explanations of a very simple fact.

P: Your mind is not like ours, that is a simple fact.

Krishnamurti: There are all these categories - drugs, breathing and the enormous effort involved in understanding - but I do not think it works that way at all.

P: I am not concerned with what the books say. I am very concerned when my mind chatters. In the moment of perceiving, I see that a certain withering away has taken place in me. But I am not free of the desire to end this chattering.

Krishnamurti: Do you really want to end it?

P: Yes.

Krishnamurti: Why does it not end? You see, it is very interesting. There is no ending to chattering.

P: That is what my mind refuses to see; that there is no action to end it.

Krishnamurti: Why? Do you want to go into it?

P: Yes.

Krishnamurti: First, why do you object if your mind chatters? If you want to end chattering, then the problem starts. Duality is the desire to end "what is". Why do you object to it? Noises are going on, buses are passing, crows are cawing. Let chattering go on. I am not going to resist it. I am not going to be interested in it. It is there. It means nothing.

P: This is your magnitude. If you ask me what is the greatest thing in your teaching, it is this. To say to oneself, to the chattering mind, leave it there. No teacher has said this before.

Krishnamurti: Which means the peripheral influence has no meaning at the centre.

P: All teachers have talked of putting an end to chattering, to the peripheral influence.

Krishnamurti: Do you not see when chattering does not matter, it is finished? It is strange how it works. I think this is the central thing which the professionals have missed. Would you say from the point of view of the guru that he is concerned only with the peripheral change?

P: No. He is concerned with the central change. To you there is no difference between the centre and the periphery. Within the so-called centre there is the first and the last step. The gurus would say get rid of the peripheral chattering.

Krishnamurti: When the sun is shining, you cannot do anything about it. When it is not there, what are we to do? (Pause) We do

not see. (Pause) What will man make of the statement "let it chatter"? The fact is there is no duality and the observer is the observed at all times. The noise of the periphery is the noise of the observer. When the observer is not, the noise is not. When there is resistance, the observer comes into existence. Can one really see that the seer is the seeing and not accept that statement as an axiom, as an interpretation? But we see that the professionals have made that into a slogan.

Is there liberation for the man who takes drugs, who takes to breathing in and out, for years? It may lead to a distorted mind. And the man who analyses and wants to understand, do you think he will find liberation? So if you deny all that, it is there on a silver platter. It is offered. Never repeat anything. Never say anything you do not know, which you have not lived. That brings a tremendous aloneness which is pure, crystal clear.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 9 NEW DELHI 27TH DECEMBER 1970 'TIME AND DETERIORATION'**

Questioner P: The key to your teachings appears to be in the understanding of time. The human mind, the structure of the brain cells have come to their present state with an in-built sense of time - as the yesterday, the today and the tomorrow. It is along this axis that the mind sustains itself. You appear to explode this process, to break through and therefore give the mind a new state of time.

How is the time cycle to end? (Pause)

What is your concept of time? The Buddha talks of the endless cycle of births and deaths, which is the yesterday, the today and the tomorrow, and the liberation from this cycle.

Krishnamurti: What is time to you? Is it the movement of the past through the present to the future; not only in space and time, but also inwardly from the yesterday, to today and tomorrow? Or is time that which is involved in covering physical or psychological distance; the time to achieve, to fulfil, to arrive? Or is time an ending as death? Or is time the memory of a pleasant or unpleasant happening; time to learn a technique or time to forget? All these involve time. Time is not a concept.

P: We know time as a sense of duration, as clock time.

Krishnamurti: Time as duration, a process, a continuity and an ending. There is not only physical time by the watch but also the psychological inward time. Time by the watch is very clear - going to the moon requires clock time. Is there any other time?

P: We see time by the clock, the sun setting and rising.



Psychological time is not different from that. If physical time has validity, my stating that I shall be tomorrow also has validity, not only physically but psychologically. All becoming is related to the tomorrow.

Krishnamurti: All becoming is not only clock time but also the desire to become.

P: The latter is possible only because there is tomorrow.

Krishnamurti: That means, you think if there was no physical time, there would be no psychological time.

P: I question the distinction you draw between the two - the physical and psychological time.

Krishnamurti: I go to Madras; that needs time as today and the tomorrow. We can also see that because there is time - as yesterday, today and tomorrow - one will be different, one will change one's character, one will become so-called perfect.

P: It is easy to see that time does not bring perfection. But the nature of the movement of thought, the sprouting, is a projection in time. I question the distinction you make.

Krishnamurti: I know that physical time exists. Even if I do not think about tomorrow, there would be tomorrow. Why am I sure that there will be a tomorrow apart from the chronological time?

It is fairly clear. This evening I will be going for a walk and between now and the walk there is an interval of ten hours. In the same way I am something and I want to be something else. In that also there is time involved. I am asking myself if there is such time at all. If I do not think about the walk, or about my becoming something else, is there time?

P: Certain measurements have to be made.

Krishnamurti: I need only physical measurement, no psychological measurement. I do not have to say I will become that; I will fulfil; I will achieve my ideal. All that involves time. If it does not enter my consciousness, where is time? It is only when I want to change this into that, there is time. I have no such desire.

P: So long as there is desire for improvement, a change for the better, which to me is a fact, there is validity to the sense of time.

Krishnamurti: That is, two years ago, I did not do my exercises properly. In two years, I have learnt, improved. I apply the same kind of argument to an inward process, which is, I say I am this and I will improve in two years time.

I know only physical time and I do not know any other time. And why do you have any other time except the physical; any other time except the chronological? Why?

You see, what is really involved is movement - the movement of improvement; the putting together involves time, both physical and psychological.

Is there any other movement except the movement of thought?

And thought is time - thought which says I have been and I will become. If thought functioned only in the movement of the physical, is there any other time? If there is no psychological being, psychological ending, is there time? We always associate physical time with psychological time, and therefore say: "I will be". The verb "to be" is time.

Now what happens when you do not want to do anything, one way or the other?

P: What would have happened if man did not have this movement of becoming as time?

Krishnamurti: He would have been destroyed. So the movement of becoming was a movement of protection.

P: Then the movement of protection as time is necessary.

krishnamurti: Agreed, protection against fire. But is there any other form of protection? P: Once you admit protection against fire, the other protection is of the same nature.

Krishnamurti: If the psychological is non-existent, is there need for protection?

P: What you say is true. If the other is non-existent there is nothing to protect. But we see that there is the other.

Krishnamurti: You accept that there is the other. You take it for granted that there is. But is there the "other"? I need only physical protection - food, clothes and shelter. Physical protection is absolutely necessary. And nothing else. Physical protection involves time. But why should there be protection about something which may not exist at all? How can you protect me psychologically? And that is what we are doing. We are doing something to protect that which does not exist and we therefore invent time.

So, psychologically there is no tomorrow but there is tomorrow because I need food.

P: If one sees that, in that is there the ending of time?

Krishnamurti: This is it. (Pause.) Shall we investigate further?

Consciousness is made up of content. Content makes consciousness. They are not separate. The content is made up of time. Consciousness is time and that we are trying to protect.

And we are using time to shield time as a conditioned state. We are trying to protect that which has no existence.

If we look at the content of consciousness, we find memories, fears, anxieties, the "I believe", the "I do not believe", which are all the product of time. And thought says this is the only thing I have, I must protect it, shield it against every possible danger. What is it that thought is trying to protect? Is it words? Dead memories? Is it a formula or a movement; the formula which encourages movement; which makes it move from here to there? Is there such movement except as an invention of thought?

The movement of thought which is born of memory, though it thinks of freedom is still of the past. Therefore, it cannot bring about radical change. Therefore, it is deceiving itself all the time. When you see that, is there time at all which needs self-protection?

If one really understood this, then one's whole activity would be entirely different. Then I would protect only the physical and not the psychological.

P: Would that not mean a state of emptiness inside; a meaningless emptiness inside?

Krishnamurti: If I only protect the physical and nothing else, obviously it is like a glass which is being protected. Therefore, one is frightened of being empty, of meaningless emptiness. But if one sees the whole thing, there is an emptiness which is tremendously significant.

S: Does time have a point at all, at which there is an impact? How does one know the texture of time?

Krishnamurti: We live between regret and hope. If there is no movement, psychological movement backwards or forwards, then what is time?

Is it height, which again means measurement? If there is no

measurement, no movement, no backward or forward movement, no height and depth, actually no movement at all, is there time? And also, why do we give such extraordinary importance to time?

P: Because time is age, decay, deterioration.

Krishnamurti: Follow it up. Time is decay. I see this body, young and healthy, getting older, dying, the whole mechanism unwinding. That is all I know. Nothing else.

P: The mind also deteriorates.

Krishnamurti: Why not? It is part of the decaying process. I brutalize the mind to achieve, to succeed, which are all factors of unnatural deterioration. Then what have I left? The body grows old. I have regrets - I cannot walk up the hill any more. The whole psychological struggle comes to an end and I am frightened. So I say "I must have a next life."

P: Does age diminish the capacity to see, to perceive?

Krishnamurti: No, if you have not spoilt it by scars, memories, quarrels.

P: If not?

Krishnamurti: Then you are going to pay for it.

P: Then there is no redemption.

Krishnamurti: At any point the first step is the last step.

P: So time can be wiped out at any point.

Krishnamurti: Anyone who says let me be aware of this whole movement and perceives totally for one second, the mind becomes young again for that second. Then the mind carries that over and again deteriorates.

P: The carrying over is karma, karma is also time.

Krishnamurti: There is past action, present action and future

action. Cause is never a static thing. There are so many things happening. The effect becomes the cause. So there is a constant movement undergoing change all the time.

P: Karma in itself has validity.

Krishnamurti: I plant the seed, it will grow up. I plant the seed in the woman and the child grows.

P: So psychological time has existed as karma. It has reality.

Krishnamurti: No. Is it the real? When you look, it ceases. Let us look at this question of cause and effect. I plant a seed in the earth and it grows. If I plant an acorn, it cannot grow to be anything but the oak.

P: I do a certain action. The seed is already planted. That will have its effect.

Krishnamurti: There I can change the effect. I plant the seed. What the seed is, the bush will be, or the tree will be. I cannot change that.

S: Can the effect be changed in psychological action?

Krishnamurti: Yes, of course. You have hit me for whatever reason - either hit physically or used words. Now, what is the response from me? If I hit you back, the movement continues. But if I do not react when you hit me, then what happens? Because there is observing, watching, I am out of it.

P: I understand at that level. I set a movement in motion. I observe. The process has ended. That act affects another. It is going to affect others.

Krishnamurti: It will affect your family, the world around you, and others.

P: The causation, action and reaction arising out of that action

are in a sense independent of my action.

Krishnamurti: The wave goes on.

P: If that is so, that is karma. A certain energy has been released. It will work itself out unless it meets other minds which quench it.

Krishnamurti: The wave can only end when both of us see it at the same level at the same time with the same intensity. This means love. Otherwise you cannot end it.

# **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 10 NEW DELHI 28TH DECEMBER 1970 'DYING AND LIVING'**

Questioner P: There must be a way of learning how to die. To know how to die is of tremendous importance to each one of us.

Krishnamurti: How do the traditionalists and the professionals - and by the professionals I mean the gurus, the Sankaracharyas, the Adi Sankaracharyas, the yogis - how do they answer this question?

P: Tradition divides life into various stages. There is Brahmacharya, a stage of celibacy, when as a student, the boy learns from a guru. The second stage is that of Grihastha, where man gets married, has children, seeks accumulation of wealth and so on. He also supports the sannyasi and the children and thereby supports society. In the third stage, the Vanaprastha, man walks out of the pursuit of worldly things and faces the stage of preparation for the final one which is Sannyasa, in which there is a giving up of name-home identity - a symbolic donning of the saffron robe.

There is also a belief that at the moment of death, all man's past comes into focus. If his karma as actions within this life have been good, then that which is the last thought which remains with him at the time of death, continues. That is carried over into the next life. They also speak of the essential need for the mind to be quiet at the time of death, for the quenching of karma, for the mind to be fully awake at the moment of death.

Krishnamurti: Will a traditional man go through all this or is it just a lot of words?

P: Generally, Sir, the orthodox Hindu has the Gita chanted at



the time of death so that his mind cuts itself away from the immediacy of family, fear, wealth, etc. This does not answer my question. How is the individual to learn how to die?

Krishnamurti: Take a leaf in the spring - how delicate it is and yet it has extraordinary strength to stand the wind; in summer it matures and in autumn it turns yellow and then it dies. It is one of the most beautiful things to see. The whole thing is a movement of beauty, of the vulnerable. The leaf that is very very tender, becomes rich, takes shape, meets summer and then when autumn comes it turns gold. There is never any sense of ugliness, never a withering away in mid summer. It is a perpetual movement from beauty to beauty. There is fullness in the spring leaf as well as in the dying leaf. I do not know if you see that.

Why cannot man live and die that way? What is the thing that is destroying him from the beginning till the end? Look at a boy of ten or twelve or thirteen - how full of laughter he is. By forty he becomes tough and hard, his whole manner and face change. He is caught in a pattern.

How does one learn to live and die, not just learn to die. How does one learn to live a life in which death is a part; in which the ending, the dying, is an innate part of living?

P: How is dying an innate part of life? Dying is something in the future, in time.

Krishnamurti: That is just it. We put death beyond the walls, beyond the movement of life. It is something to avoid, to evade, not to think about.

The question is what is living and what is dying. The two must be together, not separate. Why have we separated the two?

P: Because death is a totally different experience from life. One does not know death.

Krishnamurti: Is it? My question is why have we separated the two; why is there this vast gulf between the two? What is the reason why human beings divide the two?

P: Because in death, that which is manifest becomes non-manifest. Because both in birth and in death there is an essential mystery; an appearance and a disappearance.

Krishnamurti: Is that why we separate the two - the appearance of the child and the disappearance of the old man? Is that the reason why man has separated life from death? The organism biologically comes to an end - birth, adolescence and death - the young appearing and the old disappearing. Is that the reason? You are saying the reason for division is because there is a beginning and an ending; there is birth, childhood, maturity and death. Is that the basic reason for the fear of death? There is obviously a beginning and an ending. I was born, I will die tomorrow - there is a beginning and an ending. Why do I not accept that?

P: In death is involved the cessation of the "me" - of all that I have experienced. The final cessation of the "me" takes place.

Krishnamurti: Is that the reason for the inward division? That does not seem to be the entire reason why man has divided life from death.

P: Is it because of fear?

Krishnamurti: Is it fear that makes me divide the living and the dying? Do I know what living is and what dying is?

P: Yes.

Krishnamurti: Do I know the joy, the pleasure, that is life and

do I regard dying as the ending of that? Is that the reason why we divide a movement called living and the movement called death? The movement which we call living, is it living? Or is it merely a series of sorrows, pleasures, despairs? Is that what we call living?

P: Why do you give it special meaning?

Krishnamurti: Is there any other form of living? This is the lot of every human being. Man is afraid that this with which he had identified himself will come to an end. So he wants a continuity of this thing called life, never of ending. He wants a continuity of his sorrows, of his pleasures, miseries, confusions, conflicts. He wants the same thing to go on, that there never be an ending. And the ending of all that, he calls death. So now what is the mind doing in this? The mind is confused; it is in conflict, in despair. It is caught in pleasure, in sorrow. The mind calls that living and the mind does not want it to come to an end because it does not know what would happen if it ended. Therefore it is frightened of death.

I am asking myself, is this living? Living must have quite a different meaning than this.

P: Why? Why should it have a different meaning?

Krishnamurti: Living is fulfilment, frustration, and all that is going on. My mind is used to that and has never questioned whether that is living. My mind has never said to itself why do I call this living? Is it a habit?

P: I really do not understand your question.

Krishnamurti: After all I must ask the question.

P: Why should I ask?

Krishnamurti: My life, from the time I am born till I die is one eternal struggle.

P: Living is acting, seeing, being: the whole of that is there.

Krishnamurti: I see beauty, the sky, a lovely child. I also see conflict with my child, with my neighbours; life is a movement in conflict and pleasure.

P: Why should I question that? The mind questions only when there is sorrow, when there is a lot of pain.

Krishnamurti: Why not ask when you have pleasure? When there is no pleasure there is pain.

P: Sir, life is not a series of crises. Crises of pain are few. They are rare occasions.

Krishnamurti: But I see this is happening in life. I see it happening and therefore question this division of living and dying.

P: You do but others do not. We see there is a division; it is a fact to us.

Krishnamurti: At what level, at what depth, with what significance are you making this statement? Of course it is a fact. I am born and I will die. Then there is nothing more to be said.

P: It is not enough. The very fact we have asked how to learn to die.....

Krishnamurti: I say learn also how to live.

P: And I have listened. I have not asked that question to myself.

Krishnamurti: Learn how to live. Then what happens? If I learn how to live, I also learn how to die. I want to learn how to live. I want to learn about sorrow, pleasure, pain, beauty. I learn. Because I am learning about life I am learning about death. Learning is an act of purification, not the acquiring of knowledge. Learning is purgation. I cannot learn if my mind is full. The mind must purgate itself to learn. Therefore the mind when it wants to learn has to

empty itself of everything that it has known, then it can learn.

So there is the living which we all know. There has to be first of all a learning about this daily living. Now, is the mind capable of learning, not accumulating? Without understanding what is implied in the first act of learning, can it learn? What is implied? When I do not know, then my mind, not knowing, is capable of learning. Can the mind not know so that it can learn about living - living in which there is sorrow, agony, confusion, struggle? Can it come to it in a state of not knowing and so learn? Such a mind capable of learning about life is also capable of learning about death.

What is important is not the learning about something, but the act of learning. The mind can only learn when it does not know. We approach life with knowledge of life - with knowledge of cause, effect, karma. We come to life with the sense of the "I know", with conclusions and formulas and with these we fill the mind. But I do not know about death. So I want to learn about death. But I cannot learn about death. It is only when I know learning that I will understand death. Death is the emptying of the mind, of the knowledge which I have accumulated.

P: There can be learning of living in the learning about death. Deep down in human consciousness there is this nameless fear of ceasing to be.

Krishnamurti: The nameless fear of not being. The being is the knowing that I am this, that I am happy, that I had a marvellous time. In the same way I want to know death. I do not want to learn, I want to know. I want to know what it means to die.

P: So that I am free of fear.

Krishnamurti: If I do not know how to drive a car, I am

frightened. The moment I know, it is over. Therefore my knowing about death is in terms of the past. Knowledge is the past, so I say I must know what it means to die so that I can live. Do you see the game you are playing upon yourself, the game which the mind is playing upon itself?

The act of learning is something different from the act of knowing. You see, knowing is never in the active present. Learning is always in the active present. The learning about death - I really do not know what it means. There is no theory, no speculation that will satisfy me. I am going to find out, I am going to learn in which there is no theory, no conclusion, no hope, no speculation, but only the act of learning; therefore there is no fear of death.

To find out what it means to die, learn.

In the same way I really want to know what living is. So I must come to living with a fresh mind, without the burden of knowledge. The moment the mind acknowledges it knows absolutely nothing, it is free to learn. But there is nothing to learn. There is absolutely nothing to learn except the technological learning how to go to the moon. Freedom of learning about what - the thing that I have called living, the thing that I have called death. I do not know what it means. Therefore there is living and dying all the time. There is no death when the mind is completely free of the known - the known being the beliefs, the experiences, the conclusions, knowledge, the saying I have suffered and so on.

Intellectually we have carved life out beautifully according to our conditioning. To achieve God "I must be celibate", "I must help the poor," "I must take a vow of poverty."

Death says you cannot touch me. But I want to touch death; I

want to shape it into my pattern.

Death says you cannot touch me, you cannot play tricks upon me. The mind is used to tricks - the carving something out of experience.

Death says you cannot experience me.

Death is an original experience in the sense that it is a state I really do not know. I can invent formulas about death - the last thought is that which manifests itself - but they are other people`s thoughts. I really do not know. So I am starkly frightened. Therefore can I learn of living and therefore of dying?

So deny knowing - see what takes place. In that there is real beauty, real love, the real thing takes place.

# **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 11 NEW DELHI 29TH DECEMBER 1970 'BEAUTY AND PERCEPTION'**

Questioner P: Where is the resting place of beauty? Where does it reside? Obviously, the outer manifestations of beauty are observable; the right relationship between space, form and colour and between human beings. But what is the essence of beauty? In Sanskrit texts three factors are equated - the Truth, the Good, the Beautiful - Satyam, Sivam, Sundaram.

Krishnamurti: What are you trying to find out? Do you want to find out the nature of beauty? What do the professionals say?

P: Traditionalists would say - Satyam, Sivam, Sundaram. The artist today would not differentiate between the seemingly ugly and the seemingly beautiful, but would regard the creative act as the expression of a moment, of a perception that gets transformed within the individual and finds expression in the action of the artist.

Krishnamurti: You are asking what is beauty, what is the expression of beauty, and how does the individual fulfil himself through beauty? What is beauty? If you started as though you knew nothing about it, what would your reaction be? This is a universal problem with the Greeks, the Romans and with modern people. So what is beauty? Does it lie in the sunset, in a lovely morning, in human relationship, in the mother and the child, husband and wife, man and woman? Does it lie in the beauty of an extraordinarily subtle movement of thought and the beauty of clear perception? Is that what you call beauty?

P: Can there be beauty also in the terrible, the ugly?



Krishnamurti: In murder, in butchery, in throwing bombs, in violence, in mutilation, torture, anger, in the brutal, violent, aggressive pursuit of an idea, in wanting to be greater than somebody - is there beauty in that?

P: In all these acts there is no beauty.

Krishnamurti: What is beauty if a man hits another?

P: In the creative act of the artist who interprets the terrible, like the Guernica of Picasso, is there beauty?

Krishnamurti: So we have to ask what is expression, what is creativeness. You are asking what is beauty? It lies in a sunset, in the clear light of the morning, the evening, the light on the water, relationship and so on. And does beauty lie in any form of violence, including competitive achievement? Is there beauty per se: and not in how the artist expresses himself? A child tortured can be expressed by the artist, but is it beauty? P: Beauty is a relative thing.

Krishnamurti: The "I" which sees is relative, conditioned and is demanding self-fulfilment.

First of all, what is beauty? Is it good taste? Or has beauty nothing whatsoever to do with all this? Does beauty lie in expression and therefore fulfilment? Therefore the artist says I must fulfil myself through expression. An artist would be lost without expression which is part of beauty and self-fulfilment.

So before we go into all that, what is the inwardness, the feeling, the subtlety of the word 'beauty', so that beauty is truth and truth is beauty?

Somehow through expression we try to find beauty in architecture, in a marvellous bridge - the San Francisco Golden

Bridge or the bridge over the Seine - in the modern buildings of glass and steel and the gentleness of a fountain. We seek beauty in museums, in a symphony. We are always seeking beauty in the expression of other people. What is amiss in a man who is seeking beauty?

P: The expressions of other people are the only sources of beauty that are available to us.

Krishnamurti: Which means what?

P: In seeing the bridge a certain quality arises within me which we call beauty. It is only in the perception of something beautiful that the quality of beauty arises in many individuals.

Krishnamurti: I understand that. I am asking, is beauty in self-expression?

P: One has to start with what exists.

Krishnamurti: Which is other people's expression. Not having the perceptive eye, the strange inward feeling of beauty, I say how beautiful that picture is, that poem, that symphony. Remove all that, the individual knows no beauty. Therefore he relies for his appreciation of beauty on expression, on object, on a bridge or a good chair.

Does beauty demand expression, especially self-expression?

P: Can it exist independent of expression?

Krishnamurti: Perception of beauty is its expression; the two are not separate. Perception, seeing, acting - perceiving is expressing. In that there is no time interval at all. Seeing is doing, acting. There is no gap between seeing and doing.

I want to see the mind that sees, where seeing is acting; I want to observe the nature of the mind that has this quality of seeing and

doing. What is this mind?

It is essentially not concerned with expression. Expression may come but it is not concerned. Because expression takes time - to build a bridge, to write a poem - but the mind which sees, the mind to which perceiving is doing, to such a mind there is no time at all, and such a mind is a sensitive mind.

Such a mind is the most intelligent mind. And without that intelligence there beauty?

P: What is the place of the heart in this? Krishnamurti: Do you mean the feeling of love?

P: The word "love`' is a loaded term. If you are still, there is a strange feeling; a movement takes place from this region of the heart. What is this? Is this necessary or is it a hindrance?

Krishnamurti: This is the most essential part of it. There is no perception without that. Mere intellectual perception is no perception. Mere action of intellectual perception is fragmentary, whereas intelligence implies affection, the heart. Otherwise you are not sensitive. You cannot possibly perceive. Perceiving is acting.

Perceiving, acting without time is beauty.

P: Do the eyes, heart, do they operate at the same time in the act of perception?

Krishnamurti: Perception implies complete attention - the nerves, the ears, the brain, the heart, everything, is at the highest quality. Otherwise there is no perceiving.

P: The quality, the fragmentary nature of sensory action is that the whole organism does not operate at the same time.

Krishnamurti: The whole thing - the brain, the heart, nerves, eyes, ears, are never completely in attention. If they are not, you

cannot perceive.

So what is beauty? Does it lie in expression, in fragmentary action? I may be an artist, an engineer, a poet. The poet, engineer, artist, scientist, are fragmentary human beings. One fragment becomes extraordinarily perceptive, sensitive and its action may express something marvellous, but it is still a fragmentary action.

P: When the organism perceives violence, terror or ugliness, what is that state?

Krishnamurti: Let us take violence in its multifarious forms, but why are you asking that question?

P: It is necessary to investigate this.

Krishnamurti: Is violence part of beauty, is that what you are asking?

P: I will not put it that way.

Krishnamurti: You see violence. What is the response of a perceptive mind in the sense in which we are using the word "perceptive" to every form of destruction, which is part of violence? (Pause).

I got it. Is violence an act which is totally perceptive, or is it a fragmentary action?

P: It is not clear; it is not that.

Krishnamurti: You brought in violence. I want to investigate violence. Is violence the act of a totally harmonious perception?

P: No.

Krishnamurti: So you are saying it is a fragmentary action, and fragmentary action must deny beauty.

P: You have inverted the situation.

Krishnamurti: What is the response of a perceptive mind when

it sees violence? It looks at it, investigates it and sees it as a fragmentary action, and therefore it is not an act of beauty. What happens to a perceptive mind when it sees a violent act? It sees "what is".

P: As such, to you the nature of the mind does not change?

Krishnamurti: Why should it change? It sees "what is". Go a step further.

P: The seeing of "what is", does it change the nature of "what is"? There is perceiving. There is violence which is fragmentary. The perceiving of that, does it change the nature of violence?

Krishnamurti: Wait a minute. You are asking what is the effect of the perceiving mind when it observes violence?

P: You said it sees "what is". Does it alter "what is"? The perceiving mind, observing violence and seeing "what is", the very act of seeing, does it act on violence, changing its nature?

Krishnamurti: Are you asking whether the perceiving mind seeing the act of violence, of "what is" asks what shall I do? Is that it?

P: Such a mind does not do, but there must be action from the perceiving mind changing the nature of the act of the other.

Krishnamurti: The perceiving mind sees a violent act. Such an act is fragmentary. What action can there be by the perceiving mind?

P: The perceiving mind sees violence on the part of X. Seeing is acting.

Krishnamurti: But what can it do?

P: I would say if the perceiving mind acts, it must change the violence in X.

Krishnamurti: Let us get this clear. The perceiving mind sees another acting violently. To the perceiving mind, the very seeing is the doing. That is one fact. Perception is doing. This perceiving mind sees X in violence. What is the action involved in that seeing - stop violence?

P: All those are peripheral actions. I am saying that when a perceiving mind is confronted with an act of violence, the very act of perceiving will alter the action of violence.

Krishnamurti: There are several things involved. The perceiving mind as it walks along sees an act of violence. The man who is acting violently may respond non-violently, because the perceiving mind is near him, close to him, and suddenly this happens,

P: One comes to you with a problem - jealousy. What happens in an interview with you when a person comes to you who is confused?

In the very act of perceiving, the confusion is not.

Krishnamurti: Obviously it happens because of contact. You have taken the trouble to discuss violence and something happens because of direct sharing together of the problem. There is communication, sharing. That is simple. You see a man far away acting with violence. What is the action of the perceiving mind there?

P: There must be tremendous energy from a perceiving mind. That must have some action.

Krishnamurti: It may act. You cannot be certain of that as you can be close-ness. The other may wake up in the middle of the night, he may be aware of the strange response coming later, depending upon his sensitivity. It may be due to the perceiving

mind and its impact, whereas this close communication is different. It does change.

Let us come back. You were asking what beauty is. I think we can say the mind which is not fragmentary in itself, which is not broken up, has this beauty.

P: Has it any relationship to sensory perception if you close your eyes, your ears.....

Krishnamurti: It is independent of that. When you close your ears, eyes, there is no fragmentation and so it has this quality of beauty, of sensitivity. It is not dependent on external beauty. Put the instrument of such a mind in the middle of the noisiest city. What takes place? Physically it gets affected but not the quality of the mind, which is not fragmented. It is independent of the surroundings, therefore does not concern itself with expression.

P: That is the aloneness of it.

Krishnamurti: Therefore beauty is aloneness. Why is there this craving for self-expression? Is that craving part of beauty, whether it is the craving of a woman for a baby, a husband for sexuality in that moment of tenderness, or the artist craving for expression?

Does the perceptive mind demand any form of expression? It does not, because perceiving is expressing, is doing. The artist, the painter, the builder finds self-expression. It is fragmentary and therefore its expression is not beauty.

A mind that is conditioned, which is fragmentary, expresses that feeling of beauty, but it is conditioned. Is that beauty? Therefore, the self which is the conditioned mind, can never see beauty, and whatever it expresses must be of its quality.

P: You have still not answered one aspect of the question. There

is such a thing as creative talent; the ability to put together things in a manner which gives joy.

Krishnamurti: The housewife baking bread, but "not in order to". The moment you do that you are lost.

P: Creating joy.

Krishnamurti: Not because of something else. The speaker does not sit on the platform and speak because he gets joy.

The source of water is never empty. It is always bubbling, whether there is pollution or the worship of water; it is bubbling, it is there.

Most people who are concerned with self-expression have self-interest. It is the self which makes for fragmentation. In the absence of self, there is perception. Perception is doing and that is beauty.

I am sure the sculptor who carved the Mahesha Murti at Elephanta created it out of his meditation. Before you put your hand to a stone or a poem, the state must be of meditation. The inspiration must not be from the self.

P: The tradition of the Indian sculptor was that.

Krishnamurti: And the petty, the little, the big painter are all of that category - of self-expression.

Beauty is total self-abandonment and with total absence of the self there is "that". We are trying to catch "that" without the absence of the self and creation then becomes a tawdry affair.



## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 12 MADRAS 3RD JANUARY 1971 'THE PARADOX OF CAUSATION'**

Questioner S: In physics we have certain unsolved problems. If the world is fully causal, then you cannot change anything. If the world is not fully causal, you cannot find any laws for such a world. Either the world is causal or not. Of course, if you think of cause and effect as one single entity, if all the world is one and there is no separation into pieces, then of course there is no cause and effect.

If the whole universe is physical and suffers physical laws, then you have no choice. In a purely physical thing, there is no option. Even if the soul or whatever it is, is different from the kind of things that we are talking about, it still has no special significance if it is subject to physical laws. You cannot say that there is no cause-effect relationship because it is not natural. You cannot also accept cause and effect because there is no control over it and so what is the point in saying it? This is the paradox. What is the way out of this paradox?

Krishnamurti: Are you talking of karma?

S: No. The physical universe is closed. There is no movement here at all.

Krishnamurti: All this implies time, does it not? That is, anything put together, horizontal or vertical, is time. Cause and effect are in time. Cause becoming effect and the effect being the cause, are all within the field of time. Whether I move my hand up this way or that, whether the movement is linear or vertical - all

these are in within the field of time. Are you asking, Sir, can we move out of time?

S: No. The experience of a physical law is within time. One does not ask questions within that law and what option does one have?

Krishnamurti: None at all. Within the prison you can operate, but it is always within the field of time, cause-effect and effect-cause are within the field of time. Memory, experience, knowledge are within time and thought is the response of all that. If I have no memory, I cannot think; I will be in a state of amnesia. And thought is the response of memory. Thinking is within the field of time because it is put together through experience, knowledge, memory and memory is part of the brain cells.

So thought can never move out of the field of time, because thought is never free. Thought is always old. Between the intervals of two thoughts, one may come upon something new and translate it in terms of time. There is a gap between two thoughts. In that interval there might be a different perception and the translation of that perception is time, but the perception itself is not of time.

S: I have several questions to ask here.

Krishnamurti: Go slow. Otherwise living in time there is nothing new. Living in time, thought which is put together, when thought tries to investigate something beyond time, it is still thought. So, as long as thought and time are within the field, it is a prison; I can think it is freedom but it would be merely a conception, a formula. It is like a man who is violent and pretends he is non-violent, and the whole ideological conception in this country of being non-violent and violent at the same time is a

pretension.

So, as far as thought functions, it must function within the field of time. There is no escape from it at all. I can pretend I am thinking outside time, but it is still within time. Thought is old, whether it is the atman, the super ego, it is all part of thought.

S: Where is the way out of the paradox?

Krishnamurti: The intellect, thought functions there. And we are trying to find an answer here as a physicist, biologist, mathematician, as a bourgeois or as a sannyasi.

S: But there are laws in physics.

Krishnamurti: Of course there are. This is anyhow a madhouse and we are trying to find an answer within this. This is a fact. I have to accept it as it is. Then my question is, is there an action which is not of this? Here all action is fragmentary. You are a religious man, I am a scientist. In this everything is in a state of fragmentation.

S: Fragmentation carries laws.

Krishnamurti: Of course, but these laws have not solved human problems. Apart from physics you are a human being. Take the problem as it is, that human beings live in fragments, that society is broken up. There is fragmentation. And thought is responsible for this.

S: Thought is also responsible for all the other things.

Krishnamurti: Surely. The priests, the inventions, the discoveries, the Gods, the yogis, everything. So that is what actually is. The problem is how we live here and find something else. You cannot. The question is not how to integrate the various fragments, but how is it possible to live without fragmentation?

S: To the extent to which it is possible, you have no questions. At that point it ceases to be physics. At that level I am no longer a physicist.

Krishnamurti: Of course. You are first a human being, a non-fragmentary human being. Your action can then be a non-fragmentary action.

S: For the non-fragmented person physics does not exist.

Krishnamurti: What is the importance of an artist?

S: He transports people into states which they themselves are not able to reach. Still fragmentary, but different.

Krishnamurti: Being fragmented, he needs self-expression and the self is part of the fragmentation. So would you deny the artist his function? Now the physicist is important. But he does not come before the universe, the human heart, the human mind. He is as important or not important as the artist.

S: There is a difference in the quality. The artist is usually non-clear.

Krishnamurti: The artist is clear in his feeling, but the expression goes wrong because he is conditioned to objectivism, non-objectivism and all that. So, can I live in this world non-fragmentarily; not as a Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, communist, but as a human being?

S: Why not just live; why the word "human"?

Krishnamurti: The way we live is not human at all. It is a battle - country, wife, children, the boss - we live that way. We are at war with each other. If you call that living, I say that is not it. This perpetual struggle is not living.

S: Life is not a perpetual struggle all the time.

Krishnamurti: But most of the time it is. The window is closed.

S: But why the word "human"?

Krishnamurti: Sir, I did not use the word "individual". You know the meaning of the word "individual" - one who is indivisible. Man is not. So one realizes this fact of fragmentation, time and the constant battle for position, power, prestige, success, domination and the effort to escape from all this to reach enlightenment through the mantra, through yoga. How is this everlasting chattering, that is going on all the time, to come to an end? Is it at all possible not to be fragmented? How is it possible for the brain cells themselves to be quiet, because that is the mechanism of time, because that is being put together slowly over years. That is what we call evolution. That is the central question.

S: And that is rightly so. You bring the problem back to physics, because physics talks about the external universe but it does not talk about brain cells. If you had only a fragment of reality, then you do not accept it as consistent. If it is consistent, then it is fiction. Could the fragment be self-consistent?

Krishnamurti: I would put it this way. I would suggest, is it possible for a human being to be a physicist and be self-consistent without fragmenting himself?

I see time is the central factor. Thought is the response of memory, thought is time.

S.: For the experiencer...

Krishnamurti: The experiencer is the experienced, the observer is the observed. The observer is over there and looks at it. There is space and time. The observer separates himself through conclusions, images, formulas, etc., and so creates space and time,

and this is one of the major fragmentations.

Can the observer look without the observed who is the maker of time, space, distance? After all, Sir, how do you discover anything, say, as a physicist?

S: I am peculiar, I invent them.

Krishnamurti: There must be a period in which the inventor is silent.

S: Yes.

Krishnamurti: If he is constantly in movement, there is continuity. There must be a break. In that he sees something new.

The observer sees through the image and it is continued in time. And so he cannot see anything new. If I look at my wife with the image of years, and I call that relationship, there is nothing new in that.

So is it possible to see something new without the observer? The observer is time. Can I look at "what is", the fragmented without the observer that is time? Can there be a perception without the perceiver?

S: There is no perception without the perceiver, but the perceived is sort of waiting to be perceived.

Krishnamurti: The tree is there all the time without the perceiver, and the perceiver is looking at it through fragmentation, through the censor. Can the censor be absent and yet be observed?

S: Certainly not. Perception is a single act. There is no possibility of breaking it up.

Krishnamurti: Who is the censor? Who is the perceiver? Who is using the verb "to perceive"?

S: When you are perceiving, you do not talk about the

perceiver.

Krishnamurti: I look at the tree with knowledge. Can the observer observe without the past? Who is the thinker, the examiner?

S: When you perceive, you do not need all this.

Krishnamurti: There is the tree. Can I look at it without the observer?

S.: Yes.

Krishnamurti: There is only that. Then the perceiver comes into operation. So the image-maker can look without the image. Otherwise you cannot invent.

S: We were talking about communication. If time itself is the product of thinking, then how can thinking be imprisoned in time? Then what makes time common to all people?

M: Different people have the same notion of time.

Krishnamurti: I wonder if they do.

M: Can it be answered?

Krishnamurti: Why do you want a concept of time? You look at the watch, you have no concept about it.

S: The idea of time as movement is associated with the watch.

Krishnamurti: Within the rising and setting of the sun, there is numerical time, but is there any other psychological, inward time?

S: There is another time when you think of action in the future.

Krishnamurti: So time is the movement of the past through the present to the future. That is time. S: Time is part of thought.

Krishnamurti: Time is thought. Time is sorrow.

S: How can thought transcend itself? What is the significance of saying that thought cannot transcend itself?

Krishnamurti: But it is all the time trying it. Let me put it this way. What is the validity of time? I have to go from here to there, from this house to the other house, from one continent to another continent; I will be a manager of this factory - all that involves time, which is being put together, in sequence or not in sequence.

S: There is a great limitation to this. Time is single but experiences are not single. Time is one dimensional: one string with beads collected on it. Experience connected together gives you an impression of time, but time itself is one dimension, a single string. You can think of different strands and scales of time. They are a string of time. The connectivity of things can be complex. We do not experience the multiple connectivity of it. We can, of course, experience several things together; for example, I am listening to you, part of my mind may be thinking of something else, I may be shaking my toe; because my understanding is functioning, I watch all that. I see a series of pictures but I do not live anything.

Krishnamurti: That means the self is absent.

S: There is no single self.

Krishnamurti: That is, there is no centre.

S: There is no centre which has time in it.

Krishnamurti: That means in oneself there is no fragmentation at all. At the very core of one's being, there is no fragmentation.

S: Put that way, one sees there is a state in which there is no fragmentation.

Krishnamurti: Can one find out a quality in which there is no fragmentation, which means the ending of thought; thought breeds fragmentation, which is time?



Look, Sir, when you go through the world there are separate actions - social, political, communal, the hippy action - all fragmented. Is there an action which is not fragmented but which will cover all that?

S: When you use the word "action", action is associated with time.

Krishnamurti: I mean the active present.

S: Yes, it is.

Krishnamurti: It means there is a quality of mind in which there is no fragmentation at all. It is active present all the time.

What relationship has all this with love? What is the relationship between me, you and the artist? I think that is the core of relationship. Love has been reduced to sex and all the morality round it. If love is not there, fragmentation will go on. You will be a physicist, I will be something and we will communicate, discuss, but they are mere words.

S: How do you communicate? There has been some communication after you have talked. How do I understand that? How is it that I understand it?

Krishnamurti: What does the word "communication" mean? You and I have something in common. Common implies sharing.

S: How is it possible to share?

Krishnamurti: Wait, we are using time to communicate. "Common" implies that both of us want to understand, examine, share an issue together. I am not giving, you are not receiving. We are sharing. So a relationship of sharing is established. You are not sitting on the platform and I on the ground. What really happens when you share a problem like sorrow in human beings? It is

tremendous.

S: At the time you are sharing sorrow, after a while you do not see the person. I can understand that with deep personal emotions, but with an idea it is not possible.

Krishnamurti: What is the point of sharing ideas?

S: We share insights.

Krishnamurti: Which is understanding. But ideas are not understanding. On the contrary, formulas about understanding prevent understanding. Sir, when you share together, what takes place? Both of us have the same intensity, at the same time, at the same level. That is love. Otherwise there is no sharing. After all, Sir, to understand something together, I must forget all my experiences, prejudices, and so must you. Otherwise we cannot share.

Have you ever discussed with a Communist, with a Catholic?

S: I try to understand him.

Krishnamurti: But he will not understand you. That is simple. Take Chardin. He may have travelled extensively, covered a wide canvas, but he was fixed as a Catholic. You cannot share with a man who is fixed. Sharing implies love. Can a man who is fixed in a certain attitude, can he love?

S: He can have mystical experiences.

Krishnamurti: Because he is conditioned. He sees Krishna, Christ. He sees what he wants to. The question is whether the mind can uncondition itself? Not through time, for when the mind uses time to undo time, it is still within time.

Real understanding is out of time.

There is so little of love, of sharing, but of the other there is

plenty. (Pause)

Sir, here we ask the question what is meditation? Whether the mind can be free of all its content because consciousness is made up of the content?

M: Most often when you talk of understanding you think of one individual. To have communication you must have two minds. Also there are some thoughts which occur to me. I may later on find out it has already occurred to other people, but are there thoughts which arise only when two people are together?

S: M says there are situations when two people have ideas together which neither could have got independently.

Krishnamurti: When two people come together, what takes place? You express something verbally. I hear it, translate it and answer it; that is verbal communication. And in that process certain other factors enter. You do not quite know what you are saying. I hear it, partially understand and partially answer. So communication remains broken. If you say something very clearly and I listen to you without any reaction, there is immediate communication.

May I put it this way? Because I do not know what love is, I want you to love me. I know what love is and, therefore, I can communicate with you. I do not want anything.

But you are asking a further question and that is, is there a necessity at all for communication; necessity in the sense that through communication I uncover something more, I discover something new. Like a man who plays the violin, uses the instrument for himself or uses the instrument and there is nothing beyond it.

S: Neither for good nor evil.

Krishnamurti: Yes, like a flower - take it or leave it, because through communication we discover something together, and without communication can I discover something without verbalizing?

When you and I have a common interest, and intensity at the same level and at the same time, then communion is possible non-verbally. I do not have to tell you "I love you".

I think we are caught so much in words, in linguistic, semantic enquiry. The word is not the thing. The description is not the described.

S: And since this high level of communication is not a technique or a skill, the question arises, how does one learn anything? A child is able to learn.

Krishnamurti: Is learning a process of accumulation? That is what we do. I learn Italian, store up the words, then I speak. This is what we call learning. Is there learning which is non-accumulation? The two are totally different actions.

S: May I ask something? It may be totally irrelevant, but you will understand. Is there "the other"? Are there "other" people?

Krishnamurti: It all depends upon what you mean by "the other", "the other people".

S: Most times there is multiplicity - but there is also aloneness.

Krishnamurti: Obviously.

S: Since aloneness is real.....

Krishnamurti: Why do you call aloneness real and the other unreal? We know loneliness, resistance, the dual movement of action, defensive or aggressive action, being caught in thought, and

that brings greater isolation - we and they, my party and yours. Now can the mind go beyond isolation, beyond resistance which means can it be completely alone? Not in the sense of isolation. It is only then that I discover something new, that which is real.

S: I have experience of that state, but you caught me at that point when you asked me, "why do you divide". There are two situations. There are states when I do not see multiplicity and there are states in which I see multiplicity. I have a feeling that the states in which I see multiplicity are falling off.

Krishnamurti: Be careful, Sir. You are caught. Falling off - what do you mean, that is time. Anything that you can get rid of slowly is time, whereas the other does not involve time at all. So do not get caught, Sir. (Pause)

So is there a perception and action without time? I see danger, physical, and there is instant action. I do not say I will gradually withdraw from danger. So is there a perception of this sense of loneliness, resistance? Is there a perception, a seeing the danger of it completely, and the very seeing is the getting rid of it?

S: If you see the whole thing completely, there is no falling off. It is not there.

M: That is, there is no preparing for it.

S: This statement is at variance with my experience. I have experienced timeless moments. I loved it. I have a memory of it.

Krishnamurti: Leave it alone, Sir.

S: When I hold it, then it is pleasure.

Krishnamurti: That is what it is. Pleasure is the one main ruling principle.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 13 MADRAS 4TH JANUARY 1971 'TRADITION AND KNOWLEDGE'**

Questioner A: I was in the self-preparation group of the Theosophical Society in 1923-24. In that group, there was a preparation for understanding - viveka, vairagya and love. It was a traditional approach. A change came about when you said let us break away from organizations, from all disciplines. In the work *At the Feet of the Master*, shama is translated as control of the mind and dama as control of the body. In the traditional approach, shama seems to have been neglected. Less attention seems to have been given to the meaning and implication of shama and more than due stress laid on dama. Shanti has become a one word symbol of inner peace and it is the past-passive participle of the verb shama. So if shama is not understood, shanti is also not understood.

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by the word "sadhana"?

J: Sadhana means discipline; to acquire.

A: You neglect shama, the process by which arising of impulses and the subsiding of them takes place.

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by the word 'process' - from here to there, to proceed, a movement from here to there. A movement from here to there necessitates "sadhana". Process implies time.

A: This process of observing the ways of the mind involves time.

Krishnamurti: Time is involved in process, in discipline, in order to arrive. All that implies time, time that includes space -

from here to there - and that space can be covered through time.

J: Ramana says it is pathless, free of process, free of time.

A: Even when we realize that it is not good to suppress the arising and ending of desire, that realization is still a process, and is in time.

Krishnamurti: When we say we live in time, what do we mean by that? What does living in time mean?

A: The mind is geared to yesterday, today and tomorrow.

Krishnamurti: Not only the mind, but the numerical time - I come here at such and such a time. Living is within this numerical time, chronological time. Is that all my life? Is there any other time?

A: There is psychological time which is created by the mind.

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by time as created by the mind? A: The mind has a way of prolonging pleasure. My movement in chronological time is influenced by my mind.

Krishnamurti: What is this mind?

A: Memory.

Krishnamurti: What is memory? You were in Bangalore and today you are in Madras. You remember Bangalore. Remembrance of a past experience or occurrence is memory. That leaves a mark. What is the substance on which the mark is left?

There was an experience yesterday. It has left a mark, pain or pleasure, that is irrelevant. It has left a mark. On what has it left a mark? Why has it left a mark? What does the word experience mean?

Experience means to go through, to propel, to throw out. When that experience is not completely washed out, it leaves a mark. On

what does it leave the mark? There is a substance on which the mark has to be left. What is the substance?

A: The censor.

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by the censor? I see yesterday's experience has left a mark. On what has it left a mark?

J: On mind which is consciousness.

Krishnamurti: Which consciousness? The content of consciousness is consciousness. Without the content, there is no consciousness. Content is consciousness. The two are not separate. Find out on what memory leaves a mark.

A: That part of the mind, the brain which carries the residue.

Krishnamurti: Residue is experience. Marks are left on the brain cells themselves. See what it has done; experience unfinished, leaves a mark on the brain cells which hold memory. Memory is matter. Otherwise it cannot hold and leave a mark on the brain cells which are also matter.

See what happens, Sir. Every incomplete experience, leaves a mark which becomes knowledge. The weight makes the mind dull. The brain as accumulated knowledge has received information, which is knowledge.

A: How does one cope with a challenge?

Krishnamurti: What is coping with a challenge? If you respond according to past information, you do not know how to deal with the new problem.

So, experience leaves a residue as memory on the brain cells, which becomes the storehouse of knowledge. Knowledge is always the past. So the brain cells act, respond, function according to the information, knowledge, residue of the past. Brain is being put



together through time which is the past. And so, a mind crowded with knowledge is not a free mind.

J: Because its responses are arising out of the known.

A: At a certain level, it is essential.

Krishnamurti: Of course, half our life is that.

We see that this brain, which is put together through millennia, lives with the experience of the present and the past, the racial past, the familial, the personal past, and they are all weighted down there. We call this progress. We know technological progress, from the bullock to the jet. And the brain says that is the only way it can function with its memories; and thought says it wants to get out of the prison; so thought moves to the future - which is enlightenment, which again is a movement of thought. See what we are doing.

A: We apply the same principle of the bullock cart and the jet - that the mind through acquired knowledge, through discipline, through control of all desires, can move to freedom.

Krishnamurti: I do not think we are still clear. We accumulate knowledge, which is experience, memory, and through knowledge we try to find a way out.

A: Yes.

Krishnamurti: The traditional approach is through knowledge. And can knowledge bring about freedom? If it can, then discipline, control, sublimation, suppression are all necessary, because that is all we know. That is tradition; tradition means to carry over.

A: I see clearly it is not possible. Then why does it not stop?

Krishnamurti: I see clearly that this is a fact. It is not an assumption, a theory. I see knowledge, which is the accumulation

of centuries, is a prison and yet the mind cannot drop it.

A: This knowledge is verbal. My knowledge is based on words.

Krishnamurti: Is it verbal? I hit you. You hit me. Pain is there. The memory of that pain is there.

You hit me; I have physical pain. The remembrance of the pain is verbal but the pain is not verbal. Why has the mind translated the pain into words? Watch it, Sir.

A: Communication.

Krishnamurti: Watch it. You hit me. I have pain. That is a physical fact. Then I remember it. The remembrance is the word. Why has the fact become a word?

J: To give continuity.

Krishnamurti: Is it to give continuity to pain? Or continuity to the man who has given pain?

A: He has to reap the consequences.

J: It gives continuity to the man who receives the pain.

Krishnamurti: Look. You hit me. There is physical pain. That is all. Why do I not end it? Why does the brain say "A has hit me"? It has already translated the pain into words. Why? Because it wants to hit back. If it did not do that, it could say, "Yes, A has hit me" - full stop. But the brain remembers not only pain which becomes the psychological mark but also the man who causes the hurt.

R: Who remembers?

Krishnamurti: The cell.

A: The "I" process.

J: What is getting recorded in the cell is the image of the man who hit. Krishnamurti: Why should I remember the man?

J: Even if I forgive him, it is the same.

Krishnamurti: What happens is: I translate the fact into words, "You hit me". The moment you hit, there is pain and the "I" which says, "A has hit me, how could he, what have I done." All these are waves of words.

So your traditional approach to this problem is through knowledge; that you must have knowledge to arrive, to achieve freedom. And your knowledge is verbal. And I say, is that so? The experience of being hit is knowledge.

Now what is the traditional approach to this whole problem of pain, suffering, of being hurt? What is the traditional response? Why has tradition maintained that knowledge is necessary as a means to enlightenment?

A: This is oversimplification. Verbalizing of pain is one part, but the entire field of knowledge is racial. The word is the essence of knowledge.

Krishnamurti: Is it?

J: It is not so.

Krishnamurti: So we have to see what knowledge is (which comes from the word "to know"). Is it knowing, the active present, or the having known? The active present of the word "to know" is knowing, not having known.

A: When we talk of knowledge, it presupposes having known.

Krishnamurti: Tradition says having knowledge is essential to freedom, enlightenment. Why has this been maintained? There must have been people who must have questioned knowledge. Why have the Gita, the gurus not questioned? Why did they not see that knowledge means the past, that the past cannot possibly bring enlightenment? Why did the traditionalists not see that discipline,

sadhana have all come from knowledge?

J: Is it because people felt that memory must be maintained?

Krishnamurti: Why did the professionals not see that knowledge is the self? They talked everlastingly about wiping away the self.

A: So long as communication is verbal, you cannot wipe away the self.

Krishnamurti: Do you mean to say that the professionals can never look at anything without the word?

A: The word is compulsive, non-volitional.

Krishnamurti: You hit me. There is pain. I see that. Why should that be built up as memory? You are not answering my question. Why did the professionals not see the simple fact that accumulated knowledge can never lead to freedom?

A: Some of them did see.

Krishnamurti: Why did they not act? The professionals are you, the professionals whom you have read; therefore why cannot you drop it? Which means you have not dropped tradition. Personally, I see a very simple fact. You hit me. There is pain. That is all.

A: What about pleasure?

Krishnamurti: The same thing.

A: It involves an effort to drop. Krishnamurti: Then you enter the same circus - naming, the word, which means to strengthen the knowledge that you hit me. I do not stop there. You hit me that is a fact. My son is dead. That is a fact. To become cynical, bitter, to say "I loved him and he is gone" - all that is verbalization.

A: So long as the chattering of the mind goes on -

Krishnamurti: Let it chatter. Look. Fact is one thing and the description is another. We are caught in description, in explanation

but not with the fact. Why does that take place first of all? When the house burns, I act and I must. What is action here? You have hit me. Here there is only complete inaction, which means no verbalization.

A: This happened to me when my brother died.

Krishnamurti: Then what takes place? Why do we get caught in knowledge and make it so extraordinarily important? The capacity to reason, argue; why has it become so important? The computers are taking over that function. Why have the professionals been caught in this trap?

So, can the brain cells, put together through time as knowledge, function in knowledge when necessary, and yet be completely free of knowledge?

A: I have pleasure. I say "How nice, wonderful; I do not drop pleasure.

Krishnamurti: I have had an affair. Pleasure is involved in it. Then thought comes along and says I would like to repeat it. Which is what? Affair, memory, reaction of memory as thought, thought building images, demanding images which is part of tradition, carrying over. I have had a pleasurable experience yesterday. Carrying over to tomorrow is tradition.

A.: Also joy.

Krishnamurti: The moment you reduce it to pleasure, it is gone.

A: Is there only pleasure and pain or is there more in knowledge?

Krishnamurti: We cannot answer that unless we understand pain, pleasure and knowledge. The professionals have been blind and they have made millions of people blind. The monstrosity of it!

The whole of this country, the Christian world, all over it is the same.

The next question arises, whether the brain cells can function at one level with complete objectivity, with sane knowledge, without bringing the pleasure principle into it, pleasure through prestige, status and all that? And can the brain cells also realize that freedom is not in knowledge? That realization is freedom. How does this happen?

J: One point here - when thought craves to die, it continues.

Krishnamurti: What would be the professional's answer to this question? Why does thought cling?

J: Samadhi. I stay in samadhi and come back.

Krishnamurti: There is no meaning in that. Do the brain cells see themselves as a repository of knowledge? Does the brain cell realize it for itself? Not as a superimposed realization, but that when the principle of pleasure acts, then the mischief begins? Then there is fear, violence, aggression, everything follows. A: When the field of knowledge is distorted by pain and pleasure, then the whole mischief starts.

Krishnamurti: Why did the traditionalists, the professionals, the scriptures, the spiritual leaders not see this? Was it because authority was tremendously important - the authority of the Gita, the experience, the scriptures. Why? Why did they not see this? Because, man is the result of all this. And so you have the man who says I have read the Gita, I am the authority. Authority of what? Of somebody else's words, of knowledge?

A: We can know the various systems without being involved in them. The tradition does bring you a certain clarity. We know how

the professionals worked and how you work. You say knowledge is entirely of the past.

Krishnamurti: Obviously. If I am tethered to a post, I cannot move.

A: Then why did the professionals not see it?

Krishnamurti: They were after power.

A: You do not understand. When you say they wanted power, that is not so.

Krishnamurti: Look. What is taking place in each person? We see something very clearly for a moment. The perception is translated into experience as knowledge. There it is. I have seen it. It is finished. I do not have to carry it with me. The next minute I am watching.

J: Why is there a watcher?

Krishnamurti: Look, why does the brain insist on a continuity in knowledge? Why does the brain continue in the multiplicity of knowledge? Why does it keep on adding, multiplying, "I did this yesterday, she was so kind; why is this going on and on?"

Look Sir, the brain cannot function healthily, sanely, if it is not completely secure. Security means order. Without order the brain cannot function, it becomes neurotic. Like a child it needs complete security. When the child is secure, feels at home, it is not frightened, then it grows up as a marvellous human being. So the brain needs security and it has found security in knowledge. That is the only thing it can be secure in - experience as knowledge which acts as the future guide. So it needs security and it finds it in knowledge, in belief, in family.

A: The traditionalists provided that security through knowledge.

Krishnamurti: The mind wants security. If the professional said I really do not know, he would not be a professional.

A: Yet security at a certain level is essential.

Krishnamurti: One has to negate the Gita, the Bible, the guru, the whole thing.

One has to negate totally all the constructions that thought has put together, to wipe away and say "I do not know, I do not know a thing." One has to say "I will not say a thing, I do not know. I will not repeat a thing which somebody else has said." Then you begin.



## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 14 MADRAS 5TH JANUARY 1971 'CONFLICT AND CONSCIOUSNESS'**

Questioner A: When you say that memory is the function of the brain cells, do the brain cells as a source of intellect have any valid part to play in their own silencing?

Krishnamurti: We were talking yesterday of why knowledge has been made important as a way of enlightenment. Apparently every religious teacher has insisted on knowledge, not only in the East but also in the West. And as tradition is so strong in this country, it is really necessary to find out what part this whole systematized thinking plays in attaining enlightenment. What part does the environmental conditioning play in enlightenment? How does culture, the conditioning by culture come into being? You must cover the whole field. Take a traditional outlook like that of Nagarjuna or Sankara. Approach it from there.

A: The traditionalists say, all action, activity, arises from causes, and these causes are known.

Krishnamurti: You are making an incorrect statement. You are stating from cause to effect. There is no such thing.

A: It starts with this sutra: "All these manifestations of behaviour, it is the Buddha who has given you the source of all these manifestations. If you know the cause, you can eliminate the cause." This is the statement of the Buddha. By understanding the cause you get rid of it and he has told you the cause. All manifested thought, behaviour, is within the field of cause-effect.

Krishnamurti: I question this. We also see that what was cause

becomes the effect and effect becomes the cause. There is no fixed cause, there is no fixed effect. If there is a fixed cause, everything is fixed. Then there is no explanation enquiry, movement possible. The acorn will produce an oak tree. On this principle, we think karma operates. Now is there a fixed point at all or is there a constant movement which the mind and brain are incapable of following, living? And so the mind says there is cause and effect and it is held in that pattern.

A: Is there such a thing as cause and effect? If there is a chain of cause-effect, at any point you can hold it. At the cause point where effect becomes the cause, that is the key to this. Krishnamurti: Who is to hold it?

A: Where the effect becomes the cause, that is the point.

Krishnamurti: You insulted me yesterday, that is the cause. The insult may have been the result of my previous insult to you, and in reacting again there are a series of actions, modifications going on all the time.

You insult me; at that moment, if I am totally aware, if the mind is totally aware, there is no cause-effect at all. You insult me. The response to that insult is from the old brain that has divided itself, that has been functioning in a pattern. At the moment of insult, for the old brain not to respond can only happen when there is complete attention. In that moment of attention there is no cause-effect.

A: If there is no attention, it becomes the cause of another chain. Therefore, where an effect germinates itself into a new cause, it is there that action comes which is different.

Krishnamurti: I do not think so. I insult you. That may be the

result of my unconscious neglect of you. It has hurt you and you want to hurt me. The cause is my not greeting you, and the cause is I was interested in the birds, in the movement of their wings. I am an artist. I want to look at a bird in all its movements. Where is cause and where is effect? I see a movement of the leaves in the breeze, and I do not greet you. You are an old friend and you get insulted.

J: The cause is in oneself.

Krishnamurti: The observation of the movement is not in oneself.

J: Insult arises within me, not within you.

Krishnamurti: I have unintentionally given a cause to insult you.

J: What makes me feel insulted is within me. Cause and effect are within me.

Krishnamurti: You are saying, though I did not greet you, the very fact of that insult was born in you, not given to you. I am not at all sure.

A: I have affection for you and I see you watching the bird, I will understand, but if I do not have affection, then I will blame you. So causation is always within.

Krishnamurti: I see very clearly what you say.

A: It is not always a one to one relationship. Instead of saying this cause arises with this person, the general law is as follows: "Thus the whole thing arises with a matrix of not-knowing - avidya. You come to the focus of "I". In avidya is samskara, all that man has done. From that is consciousness, out of consciousness comes naming. These lead to the body and the six senses: then you see."

Cause is used in a broad cosmic sense. But you start from the point of "I see" and start only from there.

J: Sankara says you cannot say how ignorance began and he denied causation. Cause-effect can be ended. Before you go any further you have to exhaust the intellect. Krishnamurti: Is this part of Zen?

A: No, Sir, it is not. Awakening of intelligence is not sui generis.

J: You cannot bypass the intellect. We do not know how the process began, but we can end it.

Krishnamurti: From the seed, multiple cell, till man appeared. From unitary cell it moves on.

A: The biologist does not go beyond manifestation. To assume it is a wrong thing.

Krishnamurti: There is ignorance and there is always perception, sensation.

A: Samskara is that which is put together.

Krishnamurti: Put together in time which means evolution.

A: Then you come to the next point, vijnana, which is consciousness.

Krishnamurti: Is consciousness different from samskara? That which has been put together is consciousness.

A: No Sir, it is the matrix. Within that comes your consciousness, my consciousness.

Krishnamurti: Let us find out.

A: The matrix is common to all of us.

Krishnamurti: Samskara, you say, means put together.

A: Literally it means tendencies.

Krishnamurti: I am asking what is consciousness.

Consciousness is made of content. Without the content, is there consciousness at all? The content of consciousness is consciousness. Content has been going on for centuries.

A: Is content all or is it a segment?

Krishnamurti: I see all my conditioning makes for consciousness.

A: Man has existed for many, many years. Before his consciousness came into being, the matrix was already there.

Krishnamurti: Thought began with the unitary cell. Man has lived for more than thirty-five thousand years; during that time he has collected all kinds of experiences. All that is consciousness.

A: Out of this has come consciousness.

Krishnamurti: I do not separate the two. There is no separation of the two. If there is no content, there is no consciousness. In consciousness there are many fragments, and it is not one solid content. There are different levels, activities, attitudes, characteristics; all that is total consciousness. One part of that total consciousness, a fragment of that assumes importance. Then it says "I am consciousness" or "I am not consciousness", "I am this", "I am not this".

A: You have made a distinction between consciousness which has different levels and that point at which it says "I am different". At that point it becomes different.

R: "I" and the "not I", the division is there.

A: Then there is a difference between the matrix and the self.

Krishnamurti: Look, the content of consciousness is consciousness. Without the content there is no consciousness. The content is made

up of various divisions - my family, your family, and all that; it is made up of fragmentation. One of the fragments assumes importance over all other fragments.

R: The classical way of saying this is, the reflection imagines it is the prototype.

A: The moment there is the focus, the individualization starts.

Krishnamurti: Be careful. This is very important. When you use the word "individual" it means indivisible, in himself, no fragment. So one fragment assumes the authority, the power to criticize, the censor - all within the area which we call consciousness.

A: In the case of consciousness as the not-identified, what happens?

Krishnamurti: I do not know a thing about identification.

A: The moment identification starts the significance is that I identify myself with the part. That is the point of separation.

Krishnamurti: Do not assert anything. The content of consciousness is consciousness. When there is no content there is no consciousness. In that content are tremendous factors of conflict, of fragmentation. One fragment assumes authority, one fragment does not identify itself with other fragments. It feels insecure - there are such vast conflicts there. It does not identify with any fragment, it does that only when it says "I like this, I do not like this".

R: What is that "I"?

A: It is my own past.

J: "I" is the fragment.

A: Buddha said it is the totality of all impressions, the complex of impressions, which has created an identity for itself but which

has no true identity.

R: There is consciousness and it has immense diversity.

Krishnamurti: There are many fragments. How is it that one fragment becomes important, and the importance then goes on?

(Pause)

I see something. There is the whole field of fragmentation, which is consciousness. When does the "I" come into being?

A: Is it not implied in the field of consciousness itself? The "I" which comes out of it is latent in it.

Krishnamurti: There are all these fragments. Why does the mind not leave it alone? I see my consciousness is made up of various fragments. Why does it not leave it alone? What takes place?

A: Identification.

Krishnamurti: There is fragmentation, contradiction, there is conflict. That is all that takes place. Conflict takes place. Within that conflict is the desire to end conflict.

A: Where there is conflict, if I am not identified, it does not affect me. At that point it does not become conflict.

Krishnamurti: There is only conflict, opposition, contradiction in consciousness. There is this field of consciousness which we have described. Where there is opposition, contradiction, that is the field of conflict. There may be fragments. Each fragment being fragmentary will produce conflict, pain, pleasure, sorrow, agony, despair.

That is the field. Then what takes place?

A: I want to end it.

Krishnamurti: Here this whole structure of consciousness is a battlefield.

A: Why do you say so? Consciousness is full of irreconcilables. The moment I use the word "conflict" I have identified myself.

Krishnamurti: This field of consciousness being divided is the source of conflict - India and Pakistan. I am a Hindu and you are a Muslim. The fact is, division inevitably brings conflict.

A: That is so till you come to the point of naming; naming changes the quality.

Krishnamurti: Look at the field of conflict. There is division. Where there is division there must inevitably be conflict - my family, your family, my God, your God.

A: Does every divided fragment become aware?

Krishnamurti: I see the fact that where there is division there must be conflict. In this consciousness where there are so many fragments, there must be conflict. In the phenomenal world he is a Hindu and I am a Muslim, and that is breeding war and hatred. This is a simple, straight phenomenon. We all talk of unity and keep on with our divisions.

See, Sir, what takes place. In this field there is conflict, contradiction, fragmentation, division; when the conflict becomes acute then comes the "me" and "you". Otherwise I leave it alone. I float along in this conflict, but the moment conflict becomes acute - there is war, the Hindu-Muslim war, then I am a Hindu and you are a Muslim; identification takes place with something which I think is greater - with God, nation, idea.

So long as the conflict is mild, I leave it alone. My point is, as long as there is no conflict, there is no "I".

There is no "I" if there is no conflict. We are saying, therefore, conflict is the measure of the "I". There was no conflict yesterday,



there is conflict today, and I hope there will not be conflict tomorrow. This movement is the "I". This is the essence of the "I".

A: There are many other facets.

Krishnamurti: Is the tree different from the branches? It may have ten hundred branches. The structure of consciousness is based on this conflict. We are not discussing how to end conflict.

R: The traditional view is, division is the "I" and the separation from the conflict is also "I".

A: As long as conflict is not observed, is hidden, "I" is not.

R: Does this all begin here or does the arising of "I" go deeper?

Krishnamurti: Is there a self, the "I", which is to be studied, or is the "I" a movement? A: You say the "I" begins as a movement in consciousness.

Krishnamurti: No. There is an assumption that the "I" is static. Is it so? Is the "I" something to be learnt about? Or is the "I" a movement? Do I learn about something or do I learn in movement? The former is non-existent. It is fallacious, it is an invention.

So the central fact is division. It is the source of all conflict. That conflict may take different shapes, levels, but it is the same. Conflict may be pleasant, I may like to be bullied, beaten by my wife, but it is a part of the structure of conflict.

R: The nature of consciousness is conflict.

Krishnamurti: It is not its nature. Consciousness is conflict. If I have no conflict, what happens to me?

A: You say there is no "I" if there is no conflict. Does that mean the state of non-conflict is non-consciousness?

R: The state of non-conflict is beyond conflict. The dimension in which we live is conflict.

A: Sir, I said intensification of conflict includes naming.

Krishnamurti: Naming is all included in this. The average man swims along till a conflict becomes acute.

A: When conflict becomes acute, then naming starts.

Krishnamurti: What is naming? Why do we need naming at all? Why do I say "my wife", why? Investigate it.

A: At one level it is for communication, at another level it is subtle.

Krishnamurti: Why do I say "She is my wife?"

R: We want to prolong that "which is".

A: Because I want a continuity in that.

Krishnamurti: Sir, I say "my wife; why?"

A: Security, I want to hold on to her.

Krishnamurti: Look, I say the word is not the thing. It never is. The word is only a means of communication. The fact is not the word. The fact that she is "my wife" is legally true, but what have I done when I say it? Why have I named it? To give continuity, to strengthen the image I have built? I possess her or she possesses me, for sex, for comfort and so on. All these strengthen the image about her. The image is there to establish her as mine. In the meanwhile, she is changing; is looking at another man. I do not acknowledge her freedom, and I do not acknowledge freedom at all, for myself. So what have I done when I say she is my wife?

A: You are saying we do not like movement, we like everything static.

Krishnamurti: I want to possess her, and that is why I need her. The brain cells establish a pattern of habit and refuse to leave habit.

A: The entire consciousness is words, knowledge. I want to

understand this, what you are saying.

Krishnamurti: Knowledge is put together. Knowledge horizontally or vertically is put together. Knowledge is a process. Process implies time. Time implies thought. So through thought, through knowledge, through time, you are trying to find something which is out of time, which is not knowledge, which is not thought. You cannot.

A: The whole process which we have described must also be non-verbal.

Krishnamurti: The use of words is to communicate, to share together something common between two people. The common factor between human beings is despair, agony, sorrow. Can this be dispelled through time or can they be dispelled instantly?-Is this process to be ended with words or without words? The word is not the thing. You may describe the most marvellous food, but the description is not the food.

A: Use of words demands a complete understanding of the field of knowledge.

Krishnamurti: Words are necessary to communicate. Communication means sharing together common problems.

The word is not the thing, but we have to use the word in order to understand the thing.

Why do we make words so important? Words are meant to communicate. We have to be precise.

A: In order that communication takes place there have to be words.

Krishnamurti: When does communication take place - the sharing together of a common problem?

A: It can take place non-verbally.

Krishnamurti: To me communication means sharing together, thinking together, creating together, understanding. When are we together? Surely, not on the verbal level alone. We are together to share the problem, when we are tremendously vital, passionate, at the same level with the same intensity. When does this happen? It happens when you love something. When you love, it is finished. I kiss you, and I hold your hand, it is finished. When we lack that thing, we spin around with words. I am sure all the professionals miss that.

So our problem is how to meet, to come together at the same time, at the same level, with the same intensity. That is the real question. We do that when there is sex which we call love. Otherwise you battle for yourself and I battle for myself. This is the problem. Can I, who am in sorrow, say, "Let us come together, let us talk it over", and not talk of what Nagarjuna, Sankara and others say.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 15 MADRAS 7TH JANUARY 1971 'THE NATURE OF EXPLORATION'**

Questioner A: All our lives we have been thinking in terms of cause and operating on cause. Our whole life is living with cause, finding out the cause and trying to control the cause. Even when we know the cause we cannot operate on it. This is also a part of our experience. Buddha discovered the cause of suffering and was liberated from suffering. You say cause is effect and effect is cause, and you also point out that in this cause and effect, time is inescapable. Even after listening to you, the impact of cause and the operating on cause has become an integral part of one's thinking. Can we go into it?

Krishnamurti: What is the question?

A: To explore the validity of the cause-effect sequence in respect of understanding.

Krishnamurti: What does it mean - to explore? What is the state of the mind which explores rather than the fact of exploration? You say all action has a cause and that cause affects action and without understanding cause, do what you will with action, it will always be limited. So explore the cause, understand the cause and thereby bring about a mutation in action.

I do not know the cause of my action. There may be obvious causes and other causes which are undiscoverable by the conscious mind. I can see the superficial causes for action; but these superficial causes have very deep roots in the recesses of one's own being.

Now, can the conscious mind not only examine the superficial but also uncover the deeper? Can the conscious mind ever examine the deeper layers? And what is the state of the mind which explores? These three questions are important. Otherwise discovering the cause has no meaning.

R: You explore when you do not know.

Krishnamurti: First we asked what is the quality of the mind which is exploring? What is it exploring - the superficial or the causes which are so deeply hidden? So before I begin to explore, I must find out the state of the mind which explores. Now, what is the state of the mind, the quality of the mind that can explore? You say the Buddha said this, somebody said that, and so on, but what is the quality of the mind that has the capacity, that can explore? What is the 'I' which explores - is it crooked, myopic, far-sighted? I must see the quality of the mind which looks at the carpet before I can see anything. Obviously, it must be a free mind. Have you a mind that is free from any conclusion? Otherwise you cannot explore.

A: We have unconfessed postulates and we see and drop them.

Krishnamurti: What you are doing is analysis. You are analysing step by step. When you analyse, what takes place? There is the analyser and the thing analysed. The analyser must be extremely clear-sighted to analyse, and if this analysis is in any way twisted, it is not worth anything. The analytical, intellectual process implies time. By the time you have enquired through analysis, through time, other factors enter which distort the cause. So the way of analysis is entirely wrong. So, there has to be a dropping of analysis.

J: I am confused.

Krishnamurti: Yes, it is a fact we are confused. We do not know what to do and we begin to analyse.

A: The process of analysis is to us something concrete. You said while you operate on cause, some other factors enter. Does it mean the analysis of the problem becomes inconsequential?

Krishnamurti: I think the whole process is wrong. I am concerned with action which is put together by a series of analytical examinations, analytical implications in which time is involved. By the time I find what I sought, I am exhausted, dead. It is difficult with the conscious mind to analyse, to examine the hidden layers. So I feel this whole intellectual process is wrong. I say this without any disrespect.

A: We have only that tool - the intellect, as a means of examination. Is the intellect capable of examination except to collect, recollect, foresee, analyse? Intellect is capable of that. It is only a fragment. Therefore, the examination by a fragment can only bring about a fragmentary understanding. What do we do?

R: I cannot do anything.

Krishnamurti: You say the intellect is the only instrument one has which has the capacity to examine. Has it? Has the intellect the capacity to examine or does it examine only partially? I see the truth of that, not as a conclusion, not as an opinion, but the fact that the intellect being partial can examine only partially and therefore I no longer use the intellect.

A: Such a mind can lapse into belief. You are saying the mind senses this.

Krishnamurti: The drug-taking, the whole of that, is part of the

same phenomenon.

A: When the mind superficially turns away from analysis, it falls into other traps; so this has to be done rigorously with the intellect.

Krishnamurti: Analysis is not the way.

A: With what instrument do we explore? Our reason must corroborate what you say.

J: You arrive there by some path which is not analytical. We see the logic of it. Krishnamurti: I tell you analysis is not the way of understanding. I give you the logical sequences using reason. That is only an explanation. Why don't you see the truth that analysis is not the way?

A: When you say "I examine and this is so", it is pure logic.

Krishnamurti: What you have done is to come to a conclusion through logic, but we are not talking of logic. Logic has led you to analysis. Somebody says your logic is false, because your logic is based on the fact of intellect, which is partial; therefore partial examination is no examination at all.

A: It is partial analysis.

Krishnamurti: It is like saying that I love my wife partially.

A: In the effort to understand environment, nature, outer phenomenon man has developed certain instruments and here too we use the same instruments; but they are inadequate.

Krishnamurti: They are not inadequate. They are not adequate. Analysis, process, involves time. As it involves time, it must be partial. The partial is brought about by the intellect, because the intellect is part of the whole structure.

A: What is the instrument which explores when you put the



question? When we put the question, we go back to the intellect.

Krishnamurti: You began by saying that the intellect is the only instrument of examination. I say the intellect is partial and, therefore, your examination will be lopsided. Therefore your examination is invalid.

A: It is very clear that the intellect is partial and cannot see, but it starts working through habit.

Krishnamurti: "A" began by telling of cause-effect, effect-cause - those are processes of analysis. Analysis implies time and in such analysis there is the analyser and the analysed. The analyser must be free from past accretions, otherwise he cannot analyse. As he cannot be free of the past, analysis has no validity. Seeing that, I say it is finished. Therefore, I am looking for another way.

A: This is the shortest summary - with logic, logic is wiped out.

Krishnamurti: I see analysis is not the way. That frees the mind from a false process altogether. So the mind is much more vital. It is like a man walking with a heavy burden and the heavy burden is removed.

A: But with us the burden comes back.

Krishnamurti: The moment you perceive something to be true, how can it return? The moment you see that the snake is dangerous, you do not go back to the snake.

A: Nagarjuna says "if you see what I am saying as a concept, you are finished."

J: Is there some other way?

A: You say something. The moment you say something, the instrument stops operating, because that instrument is not going to say anything more.

Krishnamurti: But that instrument is very sharp, very clear; it abstains from any partial action taking place.

A: It is constantly watching, it can operate. Krishnamurti: No, Sir, the whole analytical process is finished.

A: When we have gone through this....

Krishnamurti: No, we are not exploring. I am showing you how to explore. What you have done is you have used intellect, the partial instrument and thought that was the complete answer. See how the mind has deceived itself, how it says "I have analysed all this", but it has not seen how partial it is, and therefore it is valueless. The intellect itself has become valueless as an instrument apart from other factors. I am asking myself if intellect is not the instrument of examination, then what takes place?

A: One comes to believe in the need for support or for the help of some prop, when one comes to this point.

Krishnamurti: The factor is, intellect is an incomplete instrument and cannot understand a total factor, a total movement. Then what is examination? If the intellect cannot explore, what is the instrument that can explore? What do Sankara, Nagarjuna, Buddha say about this? Find out. Do any of them deny the intellect?

A: They say explore with the help of the terra firma.

Krishnamurti: That is with partial vitality, energy, explore the whole energy. How can it? Why have they said this?

R: The Vedantic concept is that with the intellect you cannot see, but with the Self or the atman, which is of the very nature of perception, you can see.

A: As our minds have been heavily conditioned, when we get a

support, we hold on.

Krishnamurti: What we want to find out is, analysis and the way of the intellect is not exploration at all. It is like saying "I go partly into the tunnel." What is the quality of the mind if the intellect is not the instrument"?

A: When the intellect is totally put aside, then the mind has nothing of the past in it.

Krishnamurti: Who is it that has to put it aside? Then you are back again into the dualistic principle.

A: We see the intellect is partial.

Krishnamurti: Therefore, we are asking: What is the quality of the mind that can explore - mind being not only the intellect but the brain cells, the biological, the physical, the nerves, the whole thing, the total, the complete. What is the quality of the mind that can explore? I see that any partial movement is incomplete and, therefore, does not get anywhere. I see that partial seeing is no seeing at all, and therefore I am finished with it. It is completely over. The mind then asks what the nature of perception is that is total. And it is only such a total perception that can examine. And it may not need to examine at all, because that which has to be examined is of the partial field - division, analysis, exploration.

I am asking what total perception is, what is the quality of total perception?

A.: Movement of any kind cannot be total perception.

Krishnamurti: What is total perception?

R: It seems as if there is no instrument because the instrument belongs to something.

Krishnamurti: What is the difficulty? When you look out of the

window and see these bushes, how do you look at them? You are usually thinking about something and at the same time looking. I say you have to look, that is all. What is the difficulty? We never look. If I look at a picture, I look. I do not say this painter is so and so, this painter is better than somebody else. I have no measure. I do not verbalize. We said just now partial looking is no looking at all, therefore, the mind has finished with the partial, so when I do look, I look.

R: The element of habit is so strong.

Krishnamurti: Therefore, the mind which is caught in habit cannot explore. So we have to examine the mind which is caught in habit and not exploration. We have to understand habit. Forget exploration, causation, analysis. Forget all that. Can the mind understand habit? Let us tackle that.

A: Whatever you say with the intellect is partial.

Krishnamurti: See the truth of it, not the logic of it. You can supply the logic later. What you thought was the door is not the door. You will not move towards that once you see it, but you do not see it.

R: What is the difference between perception and recognition? For us perception is only there in the form of recognition.

Krishnamurti: You recognize through association. Recognition is part of the habit of association. So I am saying you cannot examine, explore with a mind which is used to habit. Therefore, find out the mechanism of habit. Do not find out how to examine, but find out what is habit.

A: Habits are grooves.

Krishnamurti: How have habits been formed? That is the door. I

am going through that door, now why does the mind fall into habit? What is habit? How is it that the mind falls into habit? I am going to analyse it.

We use analysis which is partial, which is not total understanding. Knowing that it is valueless, we still continue - why does the mind fall into habit? Is it because it is the easiest way to function? To get up at six, to go to bed at seven. There is no friction; I do not have to think about it.

A: I look at a tree. I do not have to think about it. And yet the mind says it is a tree.

Krishnamurti: It is a habit. Why does the mind fall into habit? It is the easiest way to live; it is easy to live mechanically. Sexually and in every other way it is easy to live that way. I can live life without effort, change, because in that I find complete security. In habit there is no examination, searching, asking.

R: I live within the field of habit.

Krishnamurti: So habit can only function within a very small field. Like a professor who is marvellous but functions in a very small field; like a monk who operates within a very small cell. The mind wanting safety, security, no change, lives in patterns. That is a partial examination. But it does not free the mind from patterns. So what shall I do?

A: Having seen this, knowing that partial understanding is no understanding, how does the mind free itself totally from habit?

Krishnamurti: I am going to show you.

A: We have examined habit, but the mind does not get out of it.

Krishnamurti: You will never go back to the analysis of habit. You are no longer going to examine the causes of habit. So the

mind is free of the burden of analysis which is part of habit. So you have got rid of it.

R: Yes, yes -

Krishnamurti: No. It must go. Not merely verbally. Habit is not only symptomatic, but psychosomatic. When we have examined habit as we have done, it is over.

A: We are not free of habit.

Krishnamurti: Because you are still insisting the door is there. We started out saying "I know". There is a certain sense of arrogance. You do not say "I want to find out."

Then what is total perception when the mind is free from habit? Habit implies conclusions, formulas, ideas, principles. All these are habits. Habit is the essence of the observer.

R: It is all that we know of the "I".

Krishnamurti: To find this out, I go to a book. That is where the damage is done, the damage which the other people have established, the Sankaras, the Buddhas and all the others. I prefer this one, I prefer the other one, and so on. I will not let go because that is my vanity. I argue. You know the cartoon which says "My guru has more enlightenment than yours". That is about all. Therefore, Sir, humility is necessary. I know absolutely nothing and I am not going to repeat a word which I have myself not found. I really do not want to know. I know this is not the way. I do not want to know anything more. That is all. The door which I thought was real is not the door. What happens later? I do not move in that direction, I will find out.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 16 MADRAS 8TH JANUARY 1971 'ORDER AND IDEATION'**

Questioner A: The greatest hindrance to perception is idea. What is the difference between fact and the idea about a fact?

Krishnamurti: How do the professionals regard perception, the seeing, the fact?

R: In Vedanta, it is said that consciousness acts through the sense organs. It sees an object. Consciousness takes the form of the object. It is like water taking the shape of the vessel. That is perception.

Krishnamurti: What is perception, the seeing, to you? You see the chest of drawers; you have the image of the chest of drawers, therefore, recognize it as the chest of drawers. When you see that piece of furniture, do you have the image first or do you see first, have the image and then recognize?

R: Instantaneously the image arises, then we call it a chest of drawers.

A: There is seeing, and the immediate naming.

Krishnamurti: So I do not have the image first. There is seeing, association, recognition, naming. I do not start with the naming, the image. That is fairly easy. I see you this morning. I saw you yesterday and, therefore, there is an image of you. So that image is you. Is there a difference between the physical object of perception and the mental image of perception?

A: There is a difference between the two. One is purely an image of a shape as in the case of an object, the other is an image

created by reactions, which are not merely form and shape.

Krishnamurti: Take a simple thing. You see a snake. The brain cells are conditioned to snakes; they know that snakes are dangerous. The brain is conditioned from childhood to the danger of a snake and so it reacts. The child, not knowing the danger, may not react, but the mother comes along and tells it.

The chest of drawers, the picture, the naming of it, has formed a picture in the brain cells. So I say it is a chest of drawers. The brain cells have been conditioned by a particular environment to call it a chest of drawers.

A: The question is, therefore, before seeing the fact, the idea about the fact arises which may not necessarily be factual.

Krishnamurti: Are you saying that there is violence, one feels angry, then the naming of the feeling and the naming is to strengthen the past?

A: I meet my brother. He has quarrelled with me and I am on my guard when I meet him next. So I am unable to see him at all. I am only seeing the idea.

R: The brain cells carry the image of the hurt.

Krishnamurti: There is violence, anger. At the moment of anger, there is no naming. A second later, I call it anger. The naming of that feeling as anger is to record that fact and strengthen the past, the memory, which has recognized that feeling as anger.

R: This is something which is different from naming.

Krishnamurti: We are coming to that. There is the chest of drawers, there is the person, then all the emotional reactions. One is angry; at the moment of anger there is no naming, a second later there is naming.



Why do we name? Why do we say "I am angry"? Why is there the need to put it into words? Or is it merely habit; an instant response?

A: A defence mechanism starts. The recognition itself is creating a situation which says "I do not want to get into conflict."

Krishnamurti: That is one part of it - naming as a process of self-defence. Why does one name a particular reaction?

R: Otherwise, one would not feel that one was existing.

Krishnamurti: Why do we name it, why do I name? You have hurt me and I name it and form a certain self-defence.

A: If I did not name, there would not be continuity.

Krishnamurti: Why does the mind give it a continuity?

R: To feel that it exists.

Krishnamurti: What exists - feeling, anger?

Why has naming become so important? I name my house, my wife, my child. Naming strengthens the me. If I did not name, what would happen? Anger would be over.

Why should there be continuity? Why does the brain, the mind, operate in continuity? Why is there this verbalization all the time?

A: Verbalization establishes that there is some residue.

Krishnamurti: Why do we do this? It may be a habit, a form of giving continuity to a sense of anger and the not ending of it. All that indicates that the mind needs occupation. Now, why is the mind demanding to be occupied with sex, God, with money? Why?

A: The mind gets stimulated all the time. If there were no stimulus, the mind would fall asleep.

Krishnamurti: Is it so? Is this very occupation not putting the mind to sleep?

A: Why does the mind slacken when it is not occupied?

Krishnamurti: On the contrary, the moment we begin to enquire why there is this necessity for any kind of occupation, the mind is already alive.

A: Mere absence of occupation is not enough.

Krishnamurti: Of course, there are many who get duller and duller every day without any occupation. But the question is why does your mind want to be occupied? Will it go to sleep if it is not? Or is it fear of emptiness that makes the mind want to be occupied?

I am enquiring. In enquiry the mind will not go to sleep. It is only the mind that is not occupied which can enquire.

So most of us fall into habits which prevent looking.

I am a Hindu and for the rest of my life I am a Hindu. You are a Muslim and for the rest of your life you are a Muslim. But if I ask myself why I am a Hindu, I open the door to enquiry.

So naming may be part of this fear of not knowing what to do.

A: Fear of leaving the shore of the known.

Krishnamurti: That is all. So, can the mind, the brain cells, can they observe the reaction called anger, not name it and so be finished with it? If it does that, there is no carrying over. When next time the reaction arises, which I have named as fear, it has quite a different meaning, a different quality.

A: Our difficulty is that we meet anger with idea.

Krishnamurti: Why have we ideas, formulas? Let us begin again - we know anger, the naming, the conditioned response. Now, we see naming is a factor which gives continuity to anger. I see the truth that by naming we give continuity. So I do not name. As I see the danger of the snake and do not touch it, I do not touch this also.

I see that the naming of the fact gives continuity to something which I have called anger and so naming gives duration. So naming is finished. Therefore, anger undergoes a change.

R: It seems as if during the moment when we are capable of observing anger, anger disappears, and anger exists in the moment when we are not capable of observing.

Krishnamurti: No. You call me a fool. I get angry. I do not like your calling me a fool. I see that. I see the falsity of naming. So where is the response? This instantly happens. Instead of naming, this happens and therefore, there is no hurt at all. "A"'s question is why do we have formulas at all. We have ideas first and then perception, action.

A: Instead of one act of perception we have our deep conditioning. All these together, the cultural, the sociological, the anthropological - are a ready frame of reference which give us a sense of security.

Krishnamurti: Why do you do this, Sir?

R: We have been brought up that way.

Krishnamurti: That is not good enough. Do you not know why we do this? We know economically and sociologically it is beneficial. Tribalism still persists. It is tremendously important. Step out of the formulas, patterns of Hinduism, Islam, you will then see what happens.

Personally, I have no formula. Why do you have it? Find out.

Formulations, which are patterns, give you safe conduct in action. We lay down the line according to which we act and in that there is safety. So fear of insecurity must be one of the reasons why we have formulas, ideas. The mind wants to be certain. The brain

cells function perfectly only when there is complete security. I do not know if you have noticed it in yourself. The brain cells function only when there is perfect order. And there is perfect order in a formula.

A: You mean physiologically, we have an inbuilt desire for order.

Krishnamurti: Even physiologically, if I do not have a certain type of order, the organism rebels. Order is absolutely necessary, essential. Formulas are the safest way to have order.

Have you not noticed that before you go to sleep, the brain cells establish order? "I should not have done this, I should not have said this." And when going to sleep, unless you establish order, it creates its own order. These are all facts. The brain cells demand order which is security. And formulas are one of the safest ways of conducting one's life without disorder. It is much safer to follow a guru. Formulas are necessary for a mind that wants order, that hopes to find order. What happens? As it hopes to find order in tribalism - the Brahmin tribe, the Hindu tribe, the national tribe - and if you step out of that, there is danger. So to call oneself an Indian is to be safe. To belong to Jehovah, is to be treated as one belonging to that group. As long as I belong to some sect, some guru, I am safe. Now what happens when you have a formula? You have your formulas and I have my formulas.

You have your security, and I who have no time, accept it. What happens to me when I accept your formula? Do you not know what happens when I am a Hindu? There is division, therefore insecurity. The brain cells demand order, because they want to have harmony. They use formulas as a means to order. The brain

cells demand order, demand security, otherwise they cannot function properly. Seeking order through formula creates division, disorder. Once I see the real danger, then what happens? Then I do not seek safety in formula, then I enquire whether there is safety in any other direction, whether there is such a thing as safety.

A: But the brain needs safety.

Krishnamurti: The brain must have order.

A: Order is not safety.

Krishnamurti: Order is safety, order is harmony, but the very search for order ends in disorder. So, seeing this, I drop all formulas. I am no longer a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Muslim. Drop all this. Dropping is intelligence. In the very dropping the mind has become very intelligent. Intelligence is order. I do not know if you see this.

In enlightenment there is order. Therefore, the brain can function in perfect condition. Then relationship has quite a different meaning.

The brain cells are seeking order in disorder. They do not see the nature of disorder. They do not understand what is disorder. It is when the brain cells reject tribalism, formulas, that in the very rejection is intelligence, which is order.

# **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 17 MADRAS 11TH JANUARY 1971 'OBJECT, KNOWLEDGE AND PERCEPTION'**

Questioner A: I think we should go into the question of perception of beauty. You said the other day that the tradition had ignored the field of beauty. We need to explore into this.

Krishnamurti: So what is the question? What is beauty? You mean perception and then beauty? Surely it is not perception and beauty, but perception. What would be the traditional approach to this?

R: One source of tradition maintains that beauty is the sense of happiness which comes when there is the ending of desire or thirst for experience.

Krishnamurti: Is this a theory or a reality?

R: The writer expressed what he felt; after all, he wrote a long time ago and only fragments of his writings remain.

A: Kalidasa says that the experience of beauty is new every moment.

R: Both in India and Greece there was this feeling that ultimate perceptions are perceptions of beauty, truth and goodness.

Krishnamurti: Are we discussing beauty or perception? We will discuss perception. What is the traditional approach to perception?

R: They talk about it at length and there are many contradictory viewpoints.

A: Perception is 'pratyaksham', perception is seeing the self-nature of things, the essential quality of things.

Krishnamurti: Seeing the essence of something is perception, is

that it? I am talking not of what you see but the act of seeing. Do they talk about the act of seeing and not what is seen?

R: They talk of what is valid knowledge and what is not valid knowledge.

Krishnamurti: Seeing is one thing and seeing something is another. Which is it they are talking about? Seeing per se or seeing something, which is it?

A: I think seeing. They are concerned with the constant danger of seeing wrongly.

Krishnamurti: No. We are not talking of seeing rightly or wrongly, but what is perception; not what you see - the chair, the rope, the snake,

A: Is there a difference between seeing and knowing?

Krishnamurti: Seeing, knowing and seeing the object; seeing through knowledge the object, the image, the symbol; and seeing - these are entirely different. What do they say about seeing?

R: They do not discuss it this way.

Krishnamurti: Like hunger is in itself: it is not related to food. You have food because you are hungry, but the nature of hunger is hunger. What is seeing, perceiving to you? Not seeing the object, but the quality of the mind that perceives? Seeing the object with the eyes is one thing, seeing with knowledge is another. I am talking about seeing in itself. Is there a seeing without knowledge, without the object? I see that cupboard. Seeing that is with word and knowledge, the word being associated with the cupboard. Is there a seeing without the image, without the object? Seeing the object through knowledge, through image, symbol, the word, the intellect; and seeing without knowledge and image, a seeing

without object.

A: What is seeing without object? One can see without knowledge. As you say, there is a cupboard without the image but still we know it is a cupboard, which means it is an object.

Krishnamurti: There is the little bush, and whether I see it or not, it will grow into a tree. It is independent of my seeing. I can call it mango and, therefore, associate it with the species mango, and the mango will grow even if I do not see it.

R: The existence of it has nothing to do with seeing.....

A: The object exists without our seeing, but such a perception may exist without the object.

Krishnamurti: That tree continues to exist.

A: In the Buddhist meditation they have referred to sky when they talk about perception without object. The sky is an object and yet not an object.

Krishnamurti: The dictionary meaning of the word "perception" is to become aware of, to apprehend. That is, you see the cupboard, you have a preconception of it; that is not perception. Is there seeing without preconception? Only the mind that has no conclusion, such a mind can see. The other cannot. If I have previous knowledge of that cupboard, the mind identifies it as cupboard. To look at that cupboard without the previous accumulation of prejudices or hurts, is to look. If I have previous hurts, memories, pain, pleasure, displeasure, I have not looked.

Is there a looking without object, without the knowledge of the object? Of course, there is. Can you look at that tree, without the knowledge of the bush, the image, the symbol, and all the rest of it? Just look.



Someone came to see me. He was a movie director. He had taken LSD, and they had tape recorded it. He was sitting back in a chair and waited for the effect. Nothing happened. He waited and moved his position a little. Immediately the space between him and the object disappeared. The observer before had space between himself and the thing he observed, which happened to be a flower. The moment space disappeared, it was not the flower, it was something extraordinary. That was an effect of the drug. But here it is different. The space between the observer and observed is not; the observer is the holder of the knowledge and it is knowledge that recognizes the cupboard. It is the observer who sees the cupboard.

First see what happens. The observer with his knowledge recognizes the cupboard. Recognition implies previous knowledge. So the observer is knowledge as the past. Now we are asking, is there perception without the observer, that is knowledge, which is the past? Perception for itself, not for or about something.

R: If the knowledge of the past is not there, the observer is not there. If the observer is not there, knowledge of the past is not there.

Krishnamurti: Therefore, it is possible to see without the observer. I am saying "possible". The possibility becomes a theory, therefore we should not deal with theories but see that the observer is the residue of the past. So the observer cannot possibly see. He can see only through the screen of the past. Therefore, his seeing is partial. If there is to be perception, the observer must not be there. Is that possible?

R: What happens to an artist? He perceives obviously with a

perception which is not the ordinary perception which we have.

Krishnamurti: Now wait a minute. Is perception intellectual?

R: No, the intellect is the past.

Krishnamurti: Therefore, it is not the seeing of an artist or the non-artist, but the seeing without the past. That is really the problem. The artist may see for a moment without the past but he translates it.

R.: It is a momentary perception.

Krishnamurti: Is there an act of perception, without the observer? Act means immediate action, not a continuous action? And the word itself, "act", means doing, not having done or will do.

So, perception is an action, not in terms of knowledge; not the action of the actor with his knowledge. So the professionals are not concerned with action, are they? They are concerned with knowledge and action. Is that right?

R: I do not know. There are some texts in which they have said that the perception of beauty is that moment when time, name, form and space do not exist.

Krishnamurti: We are not talking of beauty. Perception implies action. I know what action is when the observer acts. The observer, having learnt a particular language or technology, having acquired knowledge, acts.

A: Does perception mean direct contact between organ and object, between the sense-organ and object?

R: Traditionalists talk about mediate and immediate perception. Mediate perception is through the instrument, through a medium, whereas immediate perception does not require the sense-organ

with which to see. Perhaps immediate perception is nearer to what you are talking about.

Krishnamurti: You see the perception of knowledge and action, is action from the past. That is one thing. Perception, action is another. A: Perception itself is action, so there is no time.

Krishnamurti: The time interval comes to an end between action and knowledge, knowledge as the observer. That knowledge and action is time-binding and the other is not. So this is clear.

Then what is beauty in relation to perception?

R: It is the ending of the desire for experience. This is what the traditionalists.

Krishnamurti: The seeing of goodness, beauty, love, truth, put all that aside.

Now what is beauty? What is necessary for the perceiving of beauty?

R: It is not mere perception, because perception can be of everything, even of that which is not beautiful.

Krishnamurti: Do not bring in the ugly. Perception is acting, perceiving is acting - leave that. We are talking of beauty. You have said what the professionals have said. Now, what is beauty? Let us forget what others have said. I want to find out what is beauty. We say that building is beautiful, that poem is beautiful, that woman is beautiful. The feeling of a certain quality is beauty - the expression becoming the means of recognition of beauty. I see a building, and say how marvellous. So through the object we recognize beauty.

There are various expressions of beauty. Through the object we say that is beautiful. Through the object, we recognize what beauty

is. Now put that aside. Beauty is not expression. Beauty is not the object. What is beauty then? Is it in the beholder? The beholder is the observer. The observer with his past knowledge recognizes something to be beautiful, because his culture has told him it is beautiful, his culture has conditioned him.

A: The woman who gives pleasure is beautiful, and when she does not give pleasure, she is no longer beautiful.

Krishnamurti: I discard expression, I discard the object created and I discard the perceiver seeing beauty in the object. I discard all these. Then what is the quality of the mind that has discarded them? I have discarded everything that man has said about beauty because I see it is not in anything that has been said. What has happened to the mind which has discarded thought, thought which has created the object? What is the quality of the mind which has discarded all the structures put together by man who has said this is beautiful, this is not beautiful:

Obviously the mind is very sensitive, because it was carrying a burden before and now it is lighter. Therefore, it is sensitive, alert, awake.

R: You said you have discarded the object and the thought which has created the object.

A: Thought is knowledge.

Krishnamurti: Thought is knowledge, which has accumulated through knowledge, through culture which says beauty is this. Thought is the response of memory which has created the object. I have discarded all that, the idea of beauty as truth, goodness, love. Perception of that is action and the action is the putting away, not "I am putting away", but the putting away. So the mind is now free.

Freedom implies not freedom from something, but freedom. It is highly sensitive. Then what takes place? The mind is free, highly sensitive, is no longer burdened by the past; which means in that mind there is no observer at all; which means there is no "me" observing, because the "me" observing is a very, very limited affair. The "me", the past, is the observer, the "me" is the past. See what we have done. There is object, knowledge and perception; through knowledge we recognize the object; and we are asking the question, is there perception without knowledge, without the observer? So we discard the two: object and knowledge. In perceiving there is the action of discarding.

Again we ask what is beauty? Beauty is generally associated with object; the object created by thought, feeling, thinking. And we discard that.

Then I ask myself what is the quality of the mind that has discarded. It is really free. Freedom implies a mind that is highly sensitive. In the action of discarding, it has brought about its own sensitivity, which means there is no centre in that activity. Therefore, it is a sensitivity without time, without a centre as the observer, which means a state of mind that is intensely passionate.

R: When the object and the knowledge of the object are gone, there is no focus.

Krishnamurti: Do not use the word focus. The mind discarding what "it is not", is free. The act of perceiving what "it is not" has released the mind and the mind is free. It is not free from it, it is not free from the object, but it is free.

A: The act of perceiving and discarding of that knowledge are instantaneous and simultaneous.

Krishnamurti: That is freedom. The act of perceiving has brought about freedom, not from something. When the mind is sensitive, there is no centre, there is no "me" in it, there is the total abandonment of the self as the observer. Then the mind is full of energy because it is no longer caught in the division of sorrow, pain and pleasure. It is intensely passionate and it is such a mind that sees what is beautiful.

I see something: which is, suffering is a partial activity of energy. It is a fragmentary energy.

Energy is pleasure, energy is pain; to go to the office, to learn is energy. Human beings have divided this energy into fragments. Everything is a part, is a fragment of the various other fragments of energy. When there is no activity of the fragment, there is complete focussing of all energy.

I hate somebody and I love somebody. Both are energy - fragmentary energy acting in opposite directions - which breed conflict. Suffering is a form of energy; a fragment which we call suffering. So all our ways of living are fragmented. Each is fighting the other. If there is a harmonious whole, that energy is passion. So that energy is this, is the mind that is free, sensitive, in which the "me" as the past is completely dissolved and, therefore, such a mind is full of energy and passion, and therefore that is beauty.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 18 MADRAS 14TH JANUARY 1971 'ENERGY AND FRAGMENTATION'**

Questioner A: After listening to yesterday's talk, I wonder what is meant by energy? We only know fragmentary energy.

Krishnamurti: Would you put it differently? Would you say that all energy is fragmented?

A: If I hear your talk and I look at all the fields of my activity, I seem to know nothing but fragmentary energy.

Krishnamurti: That is energy which is fragmented.

A: In observation I see that I know only fragmented energy and I do not know what you are talking about.

Krishnamurti: There is physical energy, intellectual energy, emotional energy, there is the energy of anger, of greed; they are all various forms of energy, like human energy and cosmic energy. They are all divided, but they are energy.

A: I listen to you, but I never seem to come upon what you say.

Krishnamurti: Traditionally it has been said sexual energy must be controlled.

A: Traditionalists hold that unless all dissipations of energy are halted, one will never know the "other". It does not seem to be that way. Between suppression and the negation you speak about, there is no relationship. The truth is I only know fragmented energy.

Krishnamurti: It may be the traditional approach that holds us to a particular pattern, to that energy which is fragmentary.

A: It may be because every form of energy we know is destructive. Our intellectual energy creates systems and patterns;

our emotional energy is reaction against individuals.

Krishnamurti: Yesterday did the speaker not say that all energy springs from one source of energy?

A: What you are saying comes from a different source. And you say that the function of the intellect is to see that intellect itself is fragmentary and, therefore, it is inadequate.

When the intellect sees its inadequacy, that is the highest truth the intellect can perceive. It is only when you come to this that there is the "other". All that we seem to know is the fragmentary, and you speak of something else.

Krishnamurti: Then what will you do? How do you stop the fragmentation of energy?

A: I would not say how, because that action itself is a becoming process.

Krishnamurti: Then what will you do? How do the professionals, the traditionalists, approach this problem - the problem of various forms of energy contradicting each other and one form of energy assuming the dictatorship of the rest, trying to control, to suppress? Does this happen by introducing the atman?

A: It is shunyata, voidness. Having eliminated, this is a void. In the void is everything. Did you come to this spontaneously?

Krishnamurti: What do the professionals say?

A: Sankara says: "Acquire learning and the prestige that goes with it, so what? Acquire wealth and the power that goes with it, so what? Visit many countries, feed and entertain your friends, help the poor and the sick, bathe in the Ganga, give alms in vast quantities, repeat mantras by the million, etc., so what? All these are of no avail unless the Self is realized."



And Sankara ends by saying that only he who discovers that all these forms of prestigious action are bereft of significance for self-knowledge, he alone is capable of self-realization.

Krishnamurti: I cannot imagine that this question has not been tackled by the professionals.

A: They call it chitta and chaitanya. The common "root" is "chit".

N: Chit is consciousness.

A: Do they go into the fragmentary nature of the mind or do they say that the mind's activities are unreal?

Krishnamurti: So, what is the question, what is it that we are trying to discuss, explore?

A: We only know the various fragmented expressions of energy. Is it possible to see the entire field? Or is it a wrong question?

Krishnamurti: If one fragment or many fragments exist, who is the entity that is going to observe the totality of energy? Are our minds so conditioned that we cannot break ourselves from the conditioning?

A: We are so conditioned.

R: The other day at the discussion you said that someone slaps me. I feel hurt, etc., but if attention is given at that moment, then I do not feel hurt. There is no recording of it. But the fact is, reaction is instantaneous. I react to that hurt instantaneously. How is it possible to give attention at that moment?

Krishnamurti: What is the problem? I have been seeing only this fragment (pointing to a portion of the carpet) and you say this fragment would not exist if there was no total carpet. There is this

little bit of carpet which is part of this whole carpet. I am saying in this fragment there are many other fragments. My whole life has been spent in observing the fragment. You come along and say this is part of the whole, this would not exist if the other did not exist. But I cannot take my eyes off this fragment. I agree that this can only exist because of the whole carpet but I have never, never looked at the whole carpet. I have never moved away from this. This fragment exists because of the whole carpet. My attention has been fixed on this little bit of carpet. And I do not know how to remove my eyes and look at the whole carpet. If I can do that, there is no contradiction. If I can remove my eyes and look at the whole carpet, I see there is no contradiction, no duality. But if I say I must suppress the fragment in order to see the whole, there is duality.

R: It is intellectually clear.

Krishnamurti: It is a very good exercise. Then what do you do? The intellect is also a part. It is one of the fragments within the carpet. I am still not looking at the carpet. If intellect sees, perception is back to the fragment.

First, intellectually I have to understand what is being said. This is part of the whole. And as long as perception is focused on the fragment, there is no perception of the whole carpet. You say I understand this intellectually. So, you have already moved away. You also see that intellect is a fragment. You are looking at the whole with different parts.

R: What is looking is also a fragment.

Krishnamurti: Therefore, deny the fragment. (Pause)

You see, we are used to reading in straight lines. Therefore, we are always thinking in straight lines. If we were used to reading,

like the Chinese, vertically, then our whole thinking would be vertical. So thinking itself is a linear thinking. All that is a form of fragmentation. So, what is the question? Form your question.

(Pause)

Is there a perception which is not linear nor vertical, and, therefore, non-fragmentary?

How do you see something totally? What is the capacity of perception that sees the whole structure of human life, the whole field, at a glance?

I think I see something.

Look, there is the whole field of life, the physical, the emotional, the intellectual, the psychosomatic existence; and in that there are various contradictions - sorrows, anxieties, guilts, ambitions, humility, pride, sex, non-sex, God, no-God, communism - this is the whole field of existence. Now, how does the mind see the whole of this field? If it does not see the whole field, but merely tackles one problem, it will create more mischief.

A: It comes to this, this whole process, the seventy-five thousand years of the history of man, the entire past produces this and dies. This is "what is", there is no going back. But even this is arrived at without any movement.

Krishnamurti: First listen. There is this whole field of existence, all that we have described. There are other factors also. Now, how do I look at this whole map with all the little bridges, hamlets, towns, all that at one glance? I cannot go up in an aeroplane. The atman is the aeroplane invented by thought.

You come and tell me, look, if you try to answer the whole of existence through one of the fragments, you will only create more

confusion. Therefore you say, the whole of it. You say that and disappear. It is my job to find out. How do I set about it? I do not know what this total perception is. I see the beauty, logic, the sanity of it. I say, how am I to proceed?

A: There is very great intensity, passion in this because I also feel this is the precipice. There is no sluggishness left. It is all there at this moment.

Krishnamurti: You have this problem, this baby left in your lap. What are you going to do? You must answer. What is it that prevents total perception?

A: I see intellectually that I cannot see the whole of it.

Krishnamurti: Leave it there. What is it that prevents total perception of this vast complex, existence? Have you an answer? I have got it. Find out. (Pause)

When I enter the room, one object catches my eye. The lovely bedspread, and I casually look at other things. I say that is rather beautiful, the colouring, the design and it gives great pleasure.

So, what has happened? There is this whole field of existence. The eye catches the one thing. What is it that prevents the seeing of other things; that which makes other things shadowy, distant? Just listen.

R: The observer.

Krishnamurti: Go slow. That is beautiful but my observation of the other is still vague. This is clear. It watches this very clearly. The other is rather cloudy.

Now, in this vast field of existence, I catch one thing and the rest recedes, becomes very vague. Why is it that one thing becomes important? Or why has perception focused on that? Why is the eye,

why is perception attracted to this only?

R: It is pleasant.

Krishnamurti: Which means what? The element of pleasure. There is this whole field and one thing only attracts me. So what happens? I translate the whole of the field of existence into pleasure. I enter this room, I look at the bedspread and I say I like it and there it is. And there is this vast existence and in it, the one thing that attracts me is the maintenance of pleasure at any price.

A: For most people life is painful.

Krishnamurti: It is painful because we are thinking in terms of pleasure. Pleasure is the principle, is the factor which is preventing me from seeing the whole.

A: I was investigating this morning. Sankara says fear of pain is the thorn in the bush.

K: I see this whole field of life only in terms of pursuing pleasure. I see the whole of this, with all the complexities, in terms of pleasure or wanting pleasure. Does that prevent total perception?

R: It is very complex. Here is the fragment which is part of the whole. Then our attention is on this fragment. What is giving attention is a fragment. What is wanting pleasure out of this is a fragment.

Krishnamurti: We have said all this.

R: So, pleasure is a fragment.

Krishnamurti: No, no.

I want pleasure throughout life. There is no other thing I want. Money, sex, position, prestige, god, virtue, ideas - this is understood - pleasure through everything.

And I do not see pleasure is the thorn. I do not see that. So, in

perception there is one guiding factor, and if that is the guiding factor, how can I see the whole field which pleasure has brought about? I want pleasure; therefore, I create a society which will give me pleasure. My drive is pleasure. And that society has its morality, and that morality is always based on the principle of pleasure.

How can the mind see the whole of the field when there is only the search for pleasure? What is the factor of pleasure? It must always be personal - it must be mine, not yours. I will sacrifice my pleasure for the greater pleasure in collective work, but it is still pleasure. Pleasure is always personal.

So, look what I have done, life then becomes a movement of pleasure.

A: The validity of everything is pleasure.

Krishnamurti: So, as long as the mind is pursuing pleasure as the "me", how can I see this whole thing? I must understand pleasure, not suppress it, not deny it.

So, it is important to see the whole, not the particular and the particular must always exist when there is the pursuit of pleasure. And there must be understanding of pleasure, not the cutting it off by the intellect.

A: It cannot be cut off.

Krishnamurti: What man has done, what religions have taught is to cut off with the intellect. What tortures the saints go through, the burning, the mutilating. That is the traditional way.

So, I see the central factor that when one thing becomes all-important, then I do not see the whole of life. Why is there this pursuit of pleasure?

A: The pleasure principle is too strong.

Krishnamurti: What do the professionals say about this pursuit of pleasure?

A: They say that every pleasure leads to pain; man contemplates pain but it still leads to fragmentation. To concentrate on pain instead of pleasure is the same thing.

Krishnamurti: Why has man pursued pleasure at any cost?

A: Biological needs are so deeply ingrained in us.

Krishnamurti: There is nothing wrong in that - we need good, clean food. What is wrong with that? A clean floor to sleep on, what is wrong? But see what happens - I must have it tomorrow. That means today's biological need has been made into tomorrow's pleasure; which is, thought has taken over. So thinking is the factor one has to understand, not pleasure. A: We have come to see that pleasure is transferred in thought.

Krishnamurti: Now you have got it.

So, before you do anything with pleasure, understand thinking. Before you strengthen pleasure, before you nourish it, first find out what is thinking.

A: The movement of thought as pleasure has to be understood.

Krishnamurti: No, it is thought itself which sustains this. What shall I do with thinking? How do I stop thinking about sex or food, how?

A: We started with energy. At this point it becomes fragmented.

Krishnamurti: Thought in essence is the maker of fragments. Tradition has always talked of the suppression of thought. Act and forget it completely and do not carry it over.

# **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 19 MADRAS 16TH JANUARY 1971 'FREEDOM AND THE FIELD'**

Questioner A: You were saying the brain cells themselves are conditioned by the past, the biological and historical past, and you said the structure of the brain cells could change. Could we go into that? The brain cells seem to have an activity of their own?

Krishnamurti: I was going to ask this morning whether the professionals have ever talked of the brain cells.

R: The Indian philosophers do not mention the brain cells.

Krishnamurti: Why? Is it because when they speak of the mind, they include the brain cells?

A: They say the mind is matter. They do not go further.

Krishnamurti: Everything is recorded in the brain cells. Every incident, every impression is imprinted in the brain; one can observe the vast number of impressions in oneself. You are asking how it is possible to go beyond, to make the brain cells quiet?

A: Normally you would think that the brain would be an instrument of the intellect.

Krishnamurti: But is not the intellect the instrument of the brain rather than the other way?

A: Is it?

Krishnamurti: Let us investigate it. The capacity to reason, to compare, to weigh, to judge, to understand, to investigate, to rationalize and to act is all part of memory. The intellect formulates ideas and from that there is action.

A: The materialistic view is that thought is to the brain what



bile is to the liver and that the phenomenal manifestation is the result of the movement of the non-phenomenal. What the traditionalists say is that at death there is the complete cessation of the brain, but the complete cessation of the brain leaves, in a subtle way, a residue.

Krishnamurti: A thought?

A: The residue exists independently of the brain which has become dead. Therefore, it creates another focus. Out of its activity, something new emerges.

Krishnamurti: The brain cells are the repository of memory. The reaction of memory is thought. Thought can be independent of memory. It is like throwing a stone which is independent of the hand which throws it. Whether that thought incarnates is another matter.

A: I have a mug full of water; I pour the water into the bucket and then I take out the water again. It is not the same water I threw in. It is much more than what I put in.

Krishnamurti: This is fairly simple. What are you trying to say?

R: The brain cells and their activity are not the ultimate source of all this false movement.

A: You bring us to action. Now, we are all the time involved in activity. In discussing with you, we see activity leads to mischief. To see this is the beginning of action. Are we going to take it at the level of the brain cells or at the level of the residue; the residue which triggers the brain activity?

R: The traditional description is: I eat with my hands. There is a smell of food. I wash my hand, the odour remains. So the experience during life leaves a residue impression. The body dies

but some kind of odour of experience remains which seeks more experience.

A: You were saying the intellect itself is the result of the activity of the brain. But with the intellect I see what effect the accumulations of the past, as memory, have left on me. Even when the intellect sees this, the activity of the brain cells is in motion.

Krishnamurti: Are you trying to say that the brain cells are receiving all the time; they are recording all the time, in the state of sleeping and in the state of waking. That recording is an independent movement. That independent movement creates the capacity to think, to rationalize. The intellect can then observe the operation of the movement of thought. It can observe how thought has created itself. And that is again part of the whole structure of the brain cells. What is the question?

A: How is the structure of the brain cells to change?

Krishnamurti: That is quite a different matter. The brain cells are recording all the time - perception, design, colour, everything is being registered. One element assumes a tremendous importance. And these brain cells, receiving impressions all the time, consciously or unconsciously, are building the capacity to think, to rationalize. The instrument of this rationalization is the intellect. The two are not separate.

A: Without the intellect, would there be rationalization?

Krishnamurti: Is the intellect independent of the brain cells? Is the capacity to rationalize independent of the brain cells or being a part of them can it ever be independent? You cannot rationalize independently, because the brain cells and the intellect are part of cause-effect. And can the intellect observe the background of

memory, which is the brain?

I believe modern scientists are trying to isolate the various cells which contain memories and to explore the cells, to investigate biologically. You can do that under the microscope and if the intellect is the product of the brain, the intellect must always be conditioned by memory, by knowledge. It can project very far but it is still tethered. The intellect can seek freedom, it can never find it. It can be free only within the radius of its own tether; in itself it is limited. And freedom must be beyond this intellectual capacity, must be something outside the field.

Now, what is it that is aware of this whole phenomenon that the intellect can never be free? It can think it is free and it can project an idea, but it is not freedom because it is the product of the brain cells which are the residue of memory.

What is it that is aware that the intellect cannot go beyond the range of its own radius? I do not know if you understand the question.

A: The intellect itself can be aware of this.

Krishnamurti: I do not know. I am asking.

R: The intellect is a fragment.

Krishnamurti: There is no freedom within the field. Therefore the intellect says there must be freedom outside the field. It is still rationalization, and therefore its search outside is still within the field. Then what is it that is aware of the whole field? Is it still rationalization?

A: No.

Krishnamurti: Why not? Is it not still rationalization? It was said that the brain cells are the recording machine. They are

recording everything. That record has created an instrument which is the capacity to investigate, to explore, to criticize, which you can call the intellect. Then the intellect seeks freedom outside itself. It sees that there can be no freedom within the field and that freedom is outside. So it thinks it moves outside the field of itself. After having stated that, what happens? It sees that whatever movement it makes is within the field. Whatever movement springs from it is within the field; extend the field horizontally or vertically but it is still within the field. Therefore it is always within a prison.

The intellect sees that, observes that, explores that. You are now asking how the brain cells are to change? Proceed.

This is the movement man has been caught in. And not knowing how to get out of it, he has invented the atman.

A: The Buddhists say this process which has come into existence with a cause, has an end and the perception of it is a dead-end.

Buddhism maintains that the perception of the dead-end (they use the word pudgala) is to see, that in this there is no permanency, and that rebirth is the rebirth of the ignorance of this process. So when you observe this process as impermanent, then it must create absolutely no attachment to this process. All that is given to you is to see the impermanence, and seeing this, there is no attachment to this: and this is the dead-end. Contemplate this.

The Buddha saw only once - disease, old age and death. Seeing it once, he never turned back. The boy Krishnamurti also never looked back. The Buddha said, see the impermanency of it, in that, there is no effort at all. Krishnamurti says just "see".

Krishnamurti: Then what is the question? How are these

recording instruments with their own capacity, their own movements, how are they to switch off and enter a different dimension, even for a short period? You cannot go back to the Upanishads. In that is authority.

A: We come to the point where the intellect realizes that whatever it does is within the field and therefore, what?

Krishnamurti: You see, the dead-end man has said that and stops there. But another dead-end man says I must have something more; and so the atman comes in.

A: The Buddhists said there is no soul. That which putrefies will end. It will terminate. Do not get attached. That is all that you can do. It leads to the void, or shunyata.

R: The Vedantins also said the same thing.

A: They invented maya. It absorbed the whole of their reasoning.

Krishnamurti: The distinction between the two is non-existent. The intellect itself says, this movement is within this field. Is there any other movement? It does not say there is or there is not. It cannot rationalize, because if it says there is, it is back in the same field - the positive or negative.

The question then is, is there a movement other than this movement? Otherwise there is no freedom. A thing that functions from a centre within its own radius, however wide, is never free.

(Pause)

What is freedom?

A: When it asks is there another movement, I cannot know.

Krishnamurti: I know this is prison. I do not know what freedom is.

A: You have taken away one confusion, that all is maya.

Tradition has made that a conclusion.

Krishnamurti: My question is, is there freedom at all? Tradition would say yes, there is moksha. It is all immature.

A: Faced with this question, I have absolutely no instrument now to deal with this.

Krishnamurti: No, you have the instrument of rationalization, the intellect. Is there no validity in this enquiry? I am asking, if there is no freedom within this field, then what is freedom?

A: The intellect can never know.

Krishnamurti: Do not say it cannot know. Intellect can only know freedom within the field, like a man knowing freedom within a prison. It then asks what is freedom? If this is not "it", then what is freedom? Is there such a thing at all? And if there is no such thing, let us make the best of this - more toilets, more hangers, more rooms, make the interior perfect. So man can never be free.

The intellect rejects that there can be no freedom because it is inconceivable that there is no way out of this prison. The clever brains invent maya, atman, brahman. Now, I am asking myself, if there is no freedom, is the mind everlastingly condemned to live within this field? What is the point of it all? The communists, the materialists say you cannot get out. (Pause)

I have got it: I am not concerned whether the brain cells change or not. I see that this concern about freedom, freedom which is not a formula, which is not a conclusion, is not freedom. Right?

Then the mind says if this is not, then what is freedom?

Then it says I do not know.

It sees that in that non-knowing, there is an expectation to

know.

When I say I do not know what freedom is, there is a waiting and an expectation to find out. That means the mind does not say it does not know, but is waiting for something to happen.

I see that and I discard that. (Pause)

So I really do not know.

I am not waiting, expecting. I am not hoping something will happen, some answer will come from an outside agency. I am not expecting a thing.

There it is. There is the clue.

I know this is not "it". There is no freedom here. There is reformation, but not freedom. Reformation can never bring freedom. Man revolts against the whole idea that he can never be free, that he is condemned to live in this world. It is not intellect that revolts, but the whole organism, the whole perception. Right? Therefore it says that as this is not "it", I do not know what freedom is. I do not expect a thing, I do not hope or try to find what freedom is. I really do not know.

That not-knowing is freedom. Knowing is prison. This is logically right.

I do not know what is going to happen tomorrow. Therefore I am free of the past, free of this field.

The knowing of the field is the prison, the not-knowing of the field is also the prison.

Sir, look, I know yesterday. I know what happened yesterday. The knowing of what happened yesterday is the prison.

So, the mind that lives in a state of not-knowing is a free mind. Right?

The traditionalists went wrong when they said do not be attached. You see, they denied all relationships. They could not solve the problem of relationships, but they said do not be attached and so broke away from all relationships. They said "Be detached", therefore they withdrew into isolation.

To live with the knowledge of this field is prison. And not to know the prison is also not freedom.

And so a mind that lives in the known, is always in prison. That is all.

Can the mind say I do not know, which means the yesterday has ended?

It is the knowledge of continuity which is the prison.

A: To pursue this requires ruthlessness. Krishnamurti: Do not use the word ruthlessness. It requires tremendous delicacy. When I said I really do not know, I really do not know. Full stop. See what it does. It means a real humility, a sense of austerity. Then, yesterday has ended. So the man who has ended yesterday is really beginning again. Therefore he has to be austere. I really do not know; what a marvellous thing that is. I do not know if I may die tomorrow. Therefore there is no possibility of having any conclusion at any time, which means, never to have any burden. The burden is the knowing.

A: Can one come to this point and stay there?

Krishnamurti: You do not have to stay.

A: The mind has a way of switching back. Words take you only to a point. There is no room for switching back.

Krishnamurti: Go slow. Do not put it that way. We see this. We see the man who speaks of detachment, we see the man who



invents the atman. We come along and say, look, both are wrong. In this field there is no freedom.

Then we ask, is there freedom at all? I say I really do not know. It does not mean I have forgotten the past. In the "I do not know" there is no inclusion of the past nor a discarding of the past, nor a utilization of the past.

All that it says is, in the past there is no freedom. The past is knowledge, the past is accumulation, the past is the intellect. In that there is no freedom.

In asking is there freedom at all, man says "I really do not know". He is free of the known.

R: But the structure of the brain cells remains.

Krishnamurti: They become extraordinarily flexible. Being flexible they can reject, accept; there is movement.

A: We see something as action. So far we only know activity. We can never reject activity. It goes on. In laying down bare activity, it ceases to be a barrier to action. The normal day to day living is a process which goes on.

Krishnamurti: Are you asking what is action? What is action to a man who does not know? The man who knows is acting from knowledge and his action, his activity is always within the prison, projecting that prison into the future. It is always within the field of the known.

What is action to the man who says I do not know? He does not even ask, because he is acting.

You are missing something, which is, not to know whether tomorrow is there. Can you go into that? I will have my meal in the afternoon, I will go for a walk; apart from that all action to a man

who knows is total inaction; his action is always mischievous. The activist is always committed, involved. You see action is relationship in the field of the known. It is there in detachment, in attachment, in dominance, in subservience. Life is relationship. Have the professionals talked about relationship?

R: No.

Krishnamurti: To them relationship meant attachment and therefore they talked of detachment. But I have to live in this world. Even in the Himalayas, I need food. There is relationship. That may be the reason why the whole Indian movement of detachment has made the mind so stupid, repetitive.

A: The Buddha in his first sermon said that both detachment and attachment are ignoble. The two represented the Hindu idea of running away from the world.

Krishnamurti: Why did they not consider relationship? When the sannyasi renounces the world he cannot renounce relationship. He may not sleep with a woman but he cannot renounce relationship. I am asking myself, if you deny relationship, action becomes meaningless. What is action without relationship? Is it doing something mechanical?

A: Action is relationship.

Krishnamurti: Relationship is the primary thing. Otherwise what exists? If my father did not sleep with my mother, I would not exist. So relationship is the basic movement of life. Relationship within the field of knowledge is deadly, destructive, corrupt. That is the worldly.

So, what is action? We have separated action from relationships: as social action, political action, you follow? We

have not solved this problem of relationship. We discard it because it is too deadly to discuss relationship, because I know I have a wife and something may happen. So I do not want to discuss it. All that I say is I must be detached. If you accept all living is relationship, then what is action? There is one kind of action of technology, of mechanical action, but every other action is non-mechanical. Otherwise I reduce relationship into turning the wheel. That is why we have denied love.

A: Can we examine our relationship with nature?

Krishnamurti: What is my relationship with nature - the birds, sky, trees, flowers, the moving waters? That is my life. It is not just relationship between man and woman, but all this is part of my life. I am talking of relationship to everything. How can I be attached to the forest, to the river? I can be attached to the word, but not to the waters. You see, we miss the whole thing because we confuse the word with the thing.

A: Is it a question of re-awakening sensitivity?

Krishnamurti: No. The question is what is relationship? Be related to everything. Relationship means care; care means attention; attention means love. That is why relationship is the basis of everything. If you miss that, you miss the whole thing. Yes, Sir, this is the prison. To know is the prison and to live in the knowing is also the prison.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 20 RISHI VALLEY 21ST JANUARY 1971 'THE MATRIX OF TRADITION'**

Questioner B: In Buddhism they mention three categories of people in the world: the ordinary worldly man who has his pleasures, pain, etc; the path-winner, the person who has a glimpse of the direction; then the arhat. The worldly man might perform rituals but he is still a worldly man till he has an experience, a glimpse of the direction. The path-winner wanders away but always comes back, till such time when there is no more going back to the first stage.

Krishnamurti: A man who is of the world has a glimpse of the path - how does he have it? And once he is on the path he may wander back and forth, wander and come back to the path and finally settle down and reach the state of being an arhat. Are you asking how the worldly man is to have a glimpse?

Questioner C: What is sadhana? sadhana means to attain, to prepare that by which you attain siddhi. siddhi means goal.

Krishnamurti: That through which you attain a goal - a system, a method, a process; that means time.

C: Does it imply time? It does not necessarily imply time.

Krishnamurti: If I have to go through the gate to attain, going through the gate to attain is time.

That is a process of time. Sadhana implies a process of time.

C: Tradition also says sadhanas are useless.

Krishnamurti: Most people insist on sadhana, though they say it is not necessary. It has become part of the tradition.

B: They say it is better to go through sadhana, but they do not guarantee that you will reach through sadhana.

Krishnamurti: The word sadhana implies a process and process means things put together, and the putting together means time. Even the most scientific concept of time is things put together in a horizontal or vertical position. So sadhana means time. Though you may say it is not necessary, the word implies time. So, what is the question, Sir; what does tradition say?

B: The Buddhist tradition says that a man in sorrow has a glimpse of this. Then he is the path-winner and then he works out his salvation and becomes an arhat. What kind of operation or movement is involved in the second stage?

C: They say when you get into the non-dual state, there is no going back.

Krishnamurti: How do you come to it? C: Since it is not a process, they do not say how you come to it. They say you cannot come to it by hearing people, by studying, by rituals and sadhana. They put it negatively.

Krishnamurti: It is a question of duality. Being in the world implies duality, then there is a getting a glimpse of a non-dualistic state and the getting back to the dualistic state; is that it?

C: They say there is no duality at all, but on account of the intellectual process you create duality. Once you realize the non-duality, then there is no question of worldliness creeping into it.

Krishnamurti: Living in a dualistic state as human beings do, by negating rituals, will that get you to a non-dualistic state? You may say that there is no dualistic mould or level; a dimension in which there is no duality at all. The mind caught in the dualistic state, by

negating beliefs, rituals, etc., will it come to the "other"? Is that what the tradition says? Shall we approach this problem in a simple way, which is: one lives in a dualistic state. That is a fact. One lives in the dualistic state in which there is pain, sorrow, conflict and all that. And man says, how am I to get out of it? The non-dualistic state is merely a theory. Man does not know it. He does not know in the sense he might have read about it, but it is secondhand information. It has no value. Disregard what others have said about it.

I only know a dualistic state in which there is sorrow, pain. That is a fact. That is from where I start.

C: Some people have conflict and misery and realize that the dualistic state is the cause of the trouble. So they want to get rid of it. Some do not start from this, but they feel discontented and read, and having read, they start imagining the non-dual state.

Krishnamurti: It is a theory. The fact is one thing and the idea about the fact is another. We are not concerned with the man who supplies a conclusion derived by a specialist. We are only discussing about a man who is in conflict and is discontented with that conflict. How does he get out of it?

C: The traditional way is to explore through books. Man attains by negating and resolves by knowledge.

Krishnamurti: Proceed step by step. I am in conflict. Now, how do I resolve it? You say by knowledge. What is knowledge?

C: The realization of conflict is knowledge.

Krishnamurti: I do not have to realize it, I am in conflict. I know I am in conflict, in pain, in sorrow. What do you mean by knowledge and what do you mean by conflict? To know that I am

in conflict, is that knowledge? Or do you call knowledge what I should do about that conflict? When you use the word "knowledge", what do you mean by that? What is the sanskrit equivalent of that word?

C: Jnana.

Krishnamurti: What does that mean? Knowledge about what? Is it the know- ledge about the cause of conflict?

C: Jnana will also apply to the nature of conflict and how it arises.

Krishnamurti: How does it come into being and how does it work? What is the nature and structure of it? To know the cause is to know the structure and the nature of pain. Do you call that knowledge?

C: Sir, jnana has been divided as that which pertains to the phenomenal world and that which refers to the non-phenomenal world.

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by conflict?

C: Conflict is duality.

Krishnamurti: We know what the word "knowledge" is. What do you mean by the word "conflict"?

C: Dwandva - conflict between the two - hot and cold, pleasure and pain, happiness and sorrow.

Krishnamurti: So let us proceed: I am in conflict. I want to go out and I want to stay here; I am unhappy and I want to do something which makes for happiness. I acquire knowledge about it by seeing the cause, the nature, the structure of this conflict. The understanding of the cause, the nature, the structure of this conflict is knowledge: And knowing that, having this knowledge, will it

free the mind from conflict? So you are saying knowledge will free the mind from conflict, right, Sir?

Now, I know that I am jealous because my wife looks at another man or you have a better job than me. I know why I am jealous. I know the nature and structure of jealousy, which is: I would like to be in your place. I would like my wife not to look at you: I know the cause, I know the effect; the reaction of it is I am jealous. I see the full structure of it as an engineer sees a structure, and the knowing of it, does it free me from it? Obviously it does not.

C: Knowledge which will resolve conflict is the kind of knowledge in which there is no duality:

Krishnamurti: How do you know - because somebody else has said it?

C: By looking into why jealousy arises. Why should I be jealous?

Krishnamurti: That is analysis. Does analysis free the mind from conflict?

C: Analysis alone will not.

Krishnamurti: Knowledge is the result of analysis. I analyse. I see why I am jealous. I was angry with my wife and so on, and she has left me. Does this knowledge free me from the fear of living alone without her?

C: The feeling of jealousy does cease.

Krishnamurti: How do you propose to end jealousy? I have analysed myself till I am sick, and the next minute I am jealous again.

C: That means by analysis you have not ended jealousy.

Krishnamurti: Analysis is part of knowledge. I have



accumulated knowledge because I have analysed. I am jealous because I have tried to possess her. The realization of this is knowledge; and I possess her because I am afraid to live alone - and this is part of knowledge. And you are saying, through analysis there is accumulation of knowledge, and that knowledge is going to free you from jealousy. Does it?

C: No, Sir. I may analyse jealousy, as she is my wife and she has gone to another man; I may also say that there is no difference at all, what does it matter if she goes? It all depends on the individual.

Krishnamurti: That is all intellection. Intellection is part of analysis. As long as there is the intellect, knowledge, you are not free. So all knowledge is intellectual.

C: Jnana is not that intellectual process. The intellectual process ends with manas and buddhi.

Krishnamurti: So you are saying there is another factor which is beyond intellect, knowledge. Analysis, accumulation of knowledge through analysis is one kind of knowledge, and there is another, some other factor beyond that.

C: Which enables the buddhi to see, to discriminate.

B: How is knowledge acquired? Let us take the first step.

Krishnamurti: I have been on that road many times and I have acquired knowledge. I have seen that person often and I have talked to him. He has been friendly, non-friendly. All that is knowledge. I have accumulated through experience, through analysis, through incidents, information, which is called knowledge.

C: What makes that knowledge possible? What makes

experience possible?

Krishnamurti: Experience is possible only when there is the experiencer. You hurt me, that is experience. You say something which I do not like, and that hurts me. That is an experience, then that experience becomes knowledge. Will that knowledge end conflict?

C: No.

Krishnamurti: Then what will end conflict? Do they say it is that entity which realizes the experiencer, who has gathered this knowledge that will end conflict? If so then there is a superior entity.

C: There is a principle through which all these several experiences, all the disparate experiences of the individual are made possible. How do I know I am the experiencer?

Krishnamurti: Because I have experienced before. I know I am the experiencer because you have hurt me before. The knowledge, the previous knowledge makes me the experiencer.

B: I see sunlight; sunrise, I feel that is my experience of having seen the sun.....

Krishnamurti: Having seen the sunset once and seeing it day after day, the accumulation of that knowledge makes the experiencer.

C: They postulate an entity which does not experience.

Krishnamurti: The postulated entity is another opinion which I have acquired from somebody else.

It is fairly simple and clear. First I am aware, I get to know I am in conflict. I analyse it. Through analysis I have acquired knowledge that I am jealous; that is simple. Analysis, observation,

watching, have given me information why I am jealous, which is knowledge: And that knowledge apparently cannot get rid of jealousy. Then what will get rid of it? Do not invent another superior self: I know nothing about it: I know only conflict, analysis, knowledge and I see knowledge does not get rid of conflict.

B: What is the sub-stratum of all experience? What is that out of which all experiences arise? What is the matrix?

Krishnamurti: Is it an accumulation of experience? The matrix is things put together. The matrix of the carpet is the warp and woof. The matrix of experience is experience. Are you asking, Sir, what is the thread that makes experience or are you asking what the matter is upon which the experience leaves a pattern?

C: Traditionalists consider that knowledge as gathering of experience, memory, belongs to the realm of manas and buddhi, and this is made possible by the atman which sheds light, and without atman, the manas cannot function.

Krishnamurti: What is the material upon which experience leaves a mark? Is there such material?

Now what is it on which any experience leaves a mark? Obviously, it is the brain. The fact is, the brain is the material; the cells are the material on which every incident leaves a mark, every experience, conscious or unconscious.

All the time the brain is receiving. I see that flower, it has already registered; I see you, it has already registered. Constant recording is going on. It is there. The racial inheritance, personal inheritance; all this is leaving a mark on the brain.

B: The function of the mind is energy.

Krishnamurti: The registration of the brain is part of energy.  
The whole thing is energy.

So brain is the repository of all recording - sensory, non-sensory. That is the tape which has been collected for centuries. That is knowledge. If you did not know where you lived, you could not go there. Because you have been there, you know it.

Knowledge does not necessarily free the mind from conflict. Right? We see that. Then what will free the mind without the introduction of the atman which is part of the tradition, knowledge which I have acquired? Though I may call it atman, it is the same field of knowledge.

C: How does it come within the field of knowledge?

Krishnamurti: Unless I think about it, there is no atman.

C: Thinking about it is not realizing it. It is not within the comprehension of thought.

Krishnamurti: Thinking about something is still within the field of thought. A man who thinks about atman is still within the field of thought.

C: The man who talked of atman never thought he realized that. The only experience which they cite is that you have a sound deep sleep and you wake up. How do you remember that you had a sound sleep? In deep sleep the mind does not work.

Krishnamurti: How do you know when it does not work? The brain cells are working day and night.

Only when you get up the next morning do you know that you are tired or you have had a good sleep, etc. They are all the functions of the brain. So atman is within the field of thought. It must be. Otherwise, you would not use that word. We are saying

atman is part of the brain. Thought says it cannot solve the problem through thought and, therefore, there must be the atman.

C: But they have said the atman is outside experience.

B: Explain the material of experience.

Krishnamurti: I see the flower, I name it. There is a naming of it, the form, the verbalization; verbalization is the memory, because the brain has seen and says that is a flower.

B: Does it operate if I close my eyes?

Krishnamurti: Of course, shut your eyes, close your ears, you can still think. The moment I say there is God, the thinking about it is within the field of thought.

The man who has not thought at all, to him there is no God. The ancient ones thinking about something superior, wanting something greater, said there was God. That was the product of thought. So that was within the field of knowledge.

C: Not much importance is given to God in the Upanishads. According to their conception God and brahman are the same.

Krishnamurti: You see, someone comes along who is not a Hindu and says God, Jesus. What is the difference? He has been brought up in his culture, and you in this culture say atman.

C: We say both. God is personal, atman is not personal.

Krishnamurti: They are all the product of thought. Look, how deceptive the mind has become, caught in words. I have accumulated knowledge about suffering and suffering does not end, and not knowing how to end it, thought says there must be some other factor. So it invents the atman. It thinks about it. Otherwise the atman would not have come into existence. So atman does not end it either, because it is part of knowledge. Knowledge about

suffering has not ended suffering.

The atman does not end suffering either.

C: But they themselves have said that thought will not solve the problem.

Krishnamurti: But atman is the product of thought.

C: But atman is experienced by them. It is their personal experience.

Krishnamurti: When they say they experience atman, what does it mean?

C: They say it cannot be described.

Krishnamurti: Of course it cannot be, but it is part of thought.

C: To them it was not part of thought. They realized it.

Krishnamurti: How do I realize anything? I must recognize it, must I not? What do I recognize?

C: Recognition means seeing a thing without the process of thought. Krishnamurti: I recognize you because I have met you yesterday. If I did not, I would not know you.

C: That is not the process by which you recognize brahman.

Krishnamurti: Be simple. Let us talk logically. I must recognize a new experience. What is the process of recognition? I must have known it already, like the flower, the yellow flower - I could not recognize it if I had not seen it. So recognition of an experience is, that it has already been experienced. Therefore, atman has already been experienced to recognize it. It is, therefore, within the field of experience. So when they say you cannot experience it, what do they mean by it?

The fact is, I suffer; I say "I want to end suffering". So, why do I bring in the atman? It has no value at all. It is like a man who is

hungry and you describe food to him.

C: I agree that whatever they have said does not help.

Krishnamurti: On the contrary, they have destroyed the mind by introducing a factor which does not help.

C: Yes.

Krishnamurti: See it. Say, I will never talk about the atman, it does not mean a thing. So, how do I face this? How can the mind resolve the factor of sorrow? Not through atman. That is too childish. It can only resolve it, not through knowledge, but by looking at it without knowledge.

C: Is this possible?

Krishnamurti: Do not introduce atman. Try it. Test it out. The other you cannot test. Put it away completely. Then what happens? Then how do I look at suffering - with knowledge or without knowledge?

Do I look at it with past eyes? Do I look with eyes which are filled with the past, therefore, translate everything in terms of the past?

B: We cannot use the past as a means to free ourselves from suffering.

Krishnamurti: When you say that you see what suffering is, you are directly in relationship with suffering, not the observer observing suffering. I look at suffering without the image and the image is the past. The image of the past may be the atman. Of course, it is. Test it. Test the image as you would test it in the laboratory. In the same way you can test this. The other you cannot. The atman which I see is part of thought. There is no testing there at all. Here there is testing. I am looking at this sorrow

with past experience. My past experience divides the past as the past and the present. There is duality. The present is sorrow and I am looking at the present through the past, and translating it in terms of the past. If the mind can look at it without the past, there must be a different meaning altogether. So, I have to test it. Can the mind look without past memory? Can I look at that flower without past knowledge? Test it; you can do it or not do it.



## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 21 RISHI VALLEY 23RD JANUARY 1971 'THE GURU, TRADITION AND FREEDOM'**

Krishnamurti: Could we enquire - not only from the traditional point of view but also relate the whole field of tradition to what we have been talking about, to see the divergence, the contradictions, the similarities and dissimilarities? And also see if there is anything new in what we are saying. Let us discuss this; question it back and forth.

A: We might start with the four purusharthas - dharma, artha, kama and moksha. If we examine the traditional approach to living, we see that tradition begins with the fact that human existence has these four aspects and each of them is vital, essential for the development of understanding.

Krishnamurti: Should we not begin with the meaning of it all?

A: The fundamentalists started with the meaning of it all, with the four aspects.

Krishnamurti: Should we not enquire what it all means - human existence, human sorrow, conflict? What does it all mean? How do the professionals answer this question?

SW: In the tradition, we find two clear directions. The orthodox direction which goes by verbal interpretation of facts and the breakaway tradition, as seen in Dattatreya and the yoga vasishtha. The seers who broke away, said "no guru", "We have discovered it for ourselves", "I will not swear by the Vedas", "the whole of nature, the whole world is my guru", "observe and understand the world". In Buddha also, there was a breaking away. His teaching

represents the core of the breakaway pattern. Those who broke away were closely linked with life.

If you read the yoga vasishtha, it says that the mind is full of thoughts, conflicts; and these conflicts arise because of desire and fear; unless you are able to resolve them, you cannot understand. It talks of negative thinking. Max Mueller and some others misinterpreted the word nirodha. The word does not mean suppression, it means negation.

A great deal is said about gurus. The yoga vasishtha says that giving initiation and such other actions are meaningless. Awakening of the disciple is in right understanding and in awareness. That alone is the most primary responsible fact. These essentials are the core of the breakaway tradition.

R: And yet there are many places in the yoga vasishtha where it says without a guru, you cannot find anything.

A: Breakaway from what? If it is a breakaway from the social system, the breakaway tradition also continues the social system.

SW: To the problem of understanding, tradition gives a formal verbal approach. In the breakaway tradition, this is not so. The breakaway is not from society. Both these traditions exist. In the mathas or monasteries, they talked of the Vedas but what they said had nothing to do with life; there were others who related all that they understood to life. But whatever was said had nothing to do with the society.

R: How is it that the guru tradition has become so important?

Krishnamurti: Shall we discuss this question of guru? Shall we begin with that? What does the word "guru" mean?

SW: "Desika" is the right word, not guru. Desika means one

who helps to awaken the disciple; one who helps the seeker to understand. The word means one who learns.

R: The disciple is called shishya. Shishya is one who is capable of learning.

SW: Guru means vast, beyond, great.

Krishnamurti: The guru is one who is great, beyond, one who is profound, then what relationship has he to a disciple?

SW: In the Upanishads, it is one of love and compassion. The Upanishads maintain that compassion is the contact between the guru and the disciple.

Krishnamurti: How has the tradition now become authoritarian? How has a sense of discipline, of following, of acceptance of whatever the guru says, how has that been introduced into the relationship? The authoritarian, compulsive, destructive relationship comes in the way of real thinking, it destroys initiative. How has this relationship come into being?

SW: It is difficult to say. The two approaches must have existed for a long time. In one tradition, the guru is taken as a friend, as a person the disciple loves; in that the guru is not authoritarian at all. The other tradition exploits. It wants authority, followers.

A: Swamiji's main point is that there has not been a homogenous stream. There is the outsider and the conformist. A non-conformist is one who rejects society; he is outside society.

R: We come back again to your first question - what is it all about, apart from the question of gurus what is the fundamental answer to life?

Krishnamurti: I wonder if we could find out. Could you dig into it? Could you dig everything out of me? You understand what I

mean? You come to a well and you get water according to the size of your bucket; whatever vessel you carry, that amount of water you get. You have read a great deal of the ancient literature, you have practised, you have read what we have talked about. You are well-equipped from the traditional point of view, and you know what is happening in the world. Now, you and I meet. Dig out of me as much as you can. Question me about everything, from the beginning to the end. Question deeply as the conformist and as the non-conformist, as a guru, as a non-guru, as a disciple and as a non-disciple.

It is like going to a well with tremendous thirst, wanting to find out everything. Do it that way, Sir. Then I think it will be profitable.

SW: Then can I be absolutely free?

Krishnamurti: Break all the windows, because I feel wisdom is infinite. It has no limits, and because it has no frontiers, it is totally impersonal. So with all your experience, knowledge and understanding of tradition and the breakaway pattern which also becomes tradition, with what you know and what you have understood, from your own meditations, from your own life, you come to me. Do not be satisfied by just a few words. Dig deep.

SW: I would like to know, how you came to it yourself?

Krishnamurti: You want to know how this person came upon it? I could not tell you. You see, Sir, he apparently never went through any practice, discipline, jealousy, envy, ambition, competition, wanting power, position, prestige, fame. He did not want any of them. And therefore there was never any question of giving up. So when I say I really do not know, I think that would be the truth.

Most of the traditional teachers go through, give up, practice, sacrifice, control; they sit under a tree and come upon clarity.

SW: Then, another thing I would like to ask is, in your teachings, sensitivity, understanding, passive awareness, are factors that must saturate one's living. How did you come upon this?

A: You may have had nothing to give up and therefore no discipline, no sadhana, but what about people who have something to give up?

Krishnamurti: You are asking how I came upon this? I really could not tell you. Why do you bother about it? What importance is it how I got it?

SW: It is curiosity, it is joy.

Krishnamurti: Let us go beyond that.

SW: The moment you say awareness, attention, sensitivity, one is so full of wonder, appreciation. How did you come to this? How is it that this man is able to talk like this? And when we analyse what you say, it is so scientific, rational and so full of meaning.

Krishnamurti: You know the story of how the boy was picked up; he was born in the most orthodox Brahmin family; he was not conditioned by the tradition nor by any other factors through life - as a Hindu, as a theosophist. It did not touch him. First of all, I do not know why it did not touch him.

A: This question which he asks may be put in another idiom. How did it happen that a person who was in the midst of an environment which laid maximum stress on phenomenal life did not get caught in that life?

SW: K came by it. He is not able to explain but he talks and he uses certain terms and the whole logic of it is there; and it is a

wonder to the listener how without anything he has come to it and yet there is logic.

Krishnamurti: How is it that a man like K, not having read the sacred books, the scriptures of the east or west, how is it that not having experienced, given up, sacrificed, gone through the gamut of all this, how does he say these things? I really could not say, Sir.

A: You gave the answer a minute ago; you said wisdom is not personal.

Krishnamurti: But he says how is it that you got the wisdom without all this?

SW: I am not asking how he came by it but in his talk there is such cogency, rationality, such perfect logical sequences. It comes and the listener finds beauty, joy. It is in his heart.

Krishnamurti: When you say it has come because it is in his heart, I do not know how to put it. It comes. I do not know how; not from the heart or from the mind, but it comes. Or would you say, Sir, that it would come to any person who is really non-selfish?

SW: Perfectly, yes.

Krishnamurti: I think it would be the most logical answer.

SW: Or is it that you saw the misery of mankind and then got it?

Krishnamurti: No. To answer this question really properly, completely, one has to go into the whole question - there was that boy who was picked up; he went through all kinds of things - he was proclaimed the Messiah, he was worshipped, enormous amounts of property were given to him, he had a great following. All that did not touch him. He gave up land as he accepted land.

There was that boy and he had never read philosophy, psychology, the sacred books and he never practised anything. And there was the quality of speaking from emptiness.

SW: Yes, yes.

Krishnamurti: You understand, Sir, there is never any accumulation from which he speaks. So when you ask such a question, "How do you say these things?," that involves a much greater question, which is, whether wisdom or whatever you would like to call it, can be contained in any particular consciousness or it lies beyond all particular consciousness?

Sir, look at this valley, the hills, the trees, the rocks - the valley is all that. Without the content of the valley, there is no valley. Now, if there is no content in consciousness, there is no consciousness - in the sense of the limited. When you ask a question, "How is it that he says these things?" I really do not know. But it can be answered, that when it happens, the mind is completely empty. This does not mean that you become a medium.

SW: I derive from this, that infinity is beauty, rationality, logic. It is full of symmetry in its expression.

Krishnamurti: Sir, having said that which we just now said, what do you want to find out? You have capacity, you have read a great deal, you have knowledge, experience, you have practised and meditated - from there, ask.

SW: Consciousness is bondage. Only from emptiness can one have entry into it.

Krishnamurti: So you are asking how can a human being empty the mind?

SW: There is a traditional idea of the adhikari, the person who

can learn. And the traditional idea is that there are levels or differences in the persons who can receive or learn. What he can learn, depends on that difference. There are three levels. In the orthodox texts, they are mentioned as sattva, rajas and tamas. Those who belong to the first category - sattva - can have understanding by listening to a teacher, of understanding. The rajas category have to listen and recollect when they face a problem of life. The tamas ones cannot learn because their minds are too gross. In order to make the mind subtle, there are many methods, upasanas. Yoga starts with breath-control, meditation, the standing on the head. Even then, they say the asanas are only meant as a cleansing. It is said, whatever you do, be passive, observe "what is".

Krishnamurti: You say, as human beings are constituted, there are levels, gradations of receptivity. They are not through with the becoming process and for such people, is it possible to come upon this?

SW: That is one part of it. The other is that with most people, there are moments of understanding. But they slip away. It is a constant struggle. What does one do?

Krishnamurti: What is the question?

SW: What is such a person to do?

Krishnamurti: Knowing there are levels, is it possible to cut across these levels?

A: Is that a question of time?

SW: Can we cut across these levels or are there processes by which we can transcend the levels?

R: Tradition says that a long process of time is necessary.



SW: I do not agree with that.

R: One must have the competence to understand.

A: I say my life is a life of becoming. When I come and sit with you, you say time is irrelevant. I say "yes" because it is clear, but I am back again in the field of time, effort, etc., and this thing which I feel I understand, slips away.

Krishnamurti: The question is fairly clear. The question is that when I listen, I seem to understand and when I go away it is gone. And the other point is, how is one who is not bright, who is not rational, to break through his conditioning and come upon it? What is your answer to this?

SW: My answer from experience, the traditional answer, let man do some type of meditation by which the mind is made much more alert.

Krishnamurti: That is, do certain practices, do certain exercises, breathing, etc., till the mind is capable of understanding. And the other who says when I listen to you, I understand but it slips away. These are the two problems. First of all take a mind that has no capacity; now, how is it capable of seeing? How is such a mind capable of seeing, understanding, without practice, without the time process? Time implies process, right? Without time, how is such a mind to come upon this? My mind is dull. My mind has not the clarity to understand this thing immediately. So you tell me to practice, to breathe, to eat less, you ask me to practice all the methods and systems which will help to make my mind sharp, clear sensitive. All that involves time and when you allow time, there are other factors which enter into the mind. If I have to go from here to there, to cover that distance takes time. In covering

that distance there are other factors entering during the voyage so that I never reach there. Before I reach there I see something beautiful and I am carried away. The way is not a straight, narrow path on which I walk. Innumerable factors are happening. These incidents, happenings, impressions are going to change the movement of direction. And that thing which I am trying to understand is not a fixed point either.

A: The point that it is not a fixed thing should be explored.

Krishnamurti: I say my mind is confused, is disturbed, I do not understand.

You tell me to understand by doing these things. So you have established understanding as a fixed point, and it is not a fixed point.

SW: It is not a fixed point.

Krishnamurti Obviously. If it is a fixed point, and I am going towards it, there are other factors which enter in my journey towards it and these factors are going to influence me much more than the end.

A: That end is a projection of the unknowing mind.

Krishnamurti: That way is not the way at all. First see it. It is not a fixed point, and it can never be a fixed point; therefore, I say that is a false thing altogether. Then as it is not the way, since you are denying the whole thing, you have wiped away a tremendous field - all practices, all meditations, all knowledge. Then what have I left? I am left with the fact that I am confused, that I am dull.

Now, how do I know I am dull, how do I know I am confused? Only through comparison, because I see that you are very perceptive and I say, through comparison, through measurement, I

am dull.

I do not compare and I see what I have done through comparison. I have reduced myself to a state which I call dull through comparison, and I see that is not the way either. So I reject comparison. Am I dull then, if I do not compare? So I have rejected the system, a process, a fixed end which you have evolved as a means of enlightenment through time. I say comparison is not the way. Measurement means distance.

SW: Does it mean, that this understanding is not a matter vitally connected with capacity at all? We started with capacity.

Krishnamurti: I say I listen to you Swamiji but I do not understand. I do not know what it is that I do not understand, but you show me - time, process, fixed point, etc. You show it to me, and I deny them. So what has happened to my mind? In the very rejection, denial, the mind has become less dull. The rejection of the false makes the mind clear; and the rejection of comparison which is also false, makes the mind sharp.

So, what have I left now? I know I am dull only in comparison with you. Dullness exists in my measuring myself with what is called brightness and I say I will not measure. Therefore, am I dull? I have completely rejected comparison and comparison means conformity. What have I left? The thing I have called dull is not dull. It is "what it is". What have I left at the end of all this? All that I have left is, I will not compare any more. I will not measure myself with somebody who is superior to me and I will not tread this path which is beautifully laid down for me. So I reject all the structures which man has imposed upon me to achieve enlightenment.

So, where am I? I start from the beginning. I know nothing about enlightenment, understanding, process, comparison, becoming. I have thrown them away. I do not know. Knowledge is the means of getting hurt and tradition is the instrument by which I get hurt. I do not want that instrument and, therefore, I am not hurt. I start with complete innocence. Innocence means a mind that is incapable of being hurt.

Now, I say to myself, why did they not see this simple fact that there is no fixed point. Why? Why did they pile all this on the human mind so that I have to wade through all this, to discard all this?

It is very interesting, Sir. Why go through all this process if I have to discard it? Why did you not tell me do not compare; truth is not a fixed point? Do I flower in goodness through comparison? Can humility be gained through time, practice? Obviously not. And yet you have insisted on practice, why? When you insist on practice, you think that you are going to a fixed point. So you have deceived yourself and you are deceiving me.

You do not say to me: you know nothing and I know nothing, let us find out if what all the things human beings have imposed on other human beings are true or false. They have said enlightenment is something to be achieved through time, through discipline, through the guru. Let us find out, search it out.

Why have human beings imposed upon human beings something which is not true? Human beings have tortured themselves, castigated themselves to get enlightenment as though enlightenment was a fixed point. And they end up blind. I think that is why, Sir, the so-called man of error is much nearer the truth

than the man who practises to reach the truth.

A man who practises truth becomes impure, unchaste.

**TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 22**  
**RISHI VALLEY 24TH JANUARY 1971**  
**'FREEDOM AND THE PRISON'**

Krishnamurti: I wonder if we could discuss this morning what perception means. Apart from what the traditionalists and the professionals and the commentaries have said, what does perception mean? What is it to perceive? Is it a mere intellectual process or is it visual perception or is it a combination of both? Is it a psychosomatic state or is it something entirely different?

The mind takes in much more than the eye does. So when we talk about perception, what do we mean by that word? Is it an intellectual perception, a verbal conclusion, a verbal comprehension? Does the eye see in a linear or horizontal dimension?

Questioner B: You mean the eye as the sense-organ here?

Krishnamurti: Yes.

SW: Is the perception of the eye, the visual, sensory perception of the eye not uniform? We come to this room, I see the design of the carpet. Very soon I am seeing and not seeing. The physical eye is also not seeing all in a uniform state. There must be some factor other than the contact of the object and the senses in the awareness of "I see". The first awareness of inattention comes to me that way.

Krishnamurti: I have not come to that point. I am trying to understand what that word perception conveys. I am not speaking of attention and inattention. All that I know is that I see. There is visual perception. There is sensory perception. I see you sitting there. Then there is the image which sensory perception plus the

intellectual capacity of thought holds. That is what we generally call perception, is it not?

A: What is the meaning of the word "perception"?

Krishnamurti: To perceive: where does inattention or attention come into this?

A: I see an object. Then there is an image of that object. Then there is the memory of that image. Then I see something else and again the whole process begins.

Krishnamurti: All the sensory impressions, the impressions that are recorded, the conscious and the unconscious, the various images, conclusions, prejudices, all that is involved in perception.

Look, there is visual perception and the various images that perception, association, prejudices, have built up. And I see you and I have another series of images, and so thousands and thousands of images are recorded, taped and held in the brain cells. And when I meet you I turn on attention and the images emerge. This is what we call perception, is it not? This is the machinery that is in operation in the word "perception-' is it not? This is the ordinary operational process of perception. I want to see. That is all I know. Where does the trouble begin? Now, what is wrong with it?

A: The factor of sensitivity and the varying degrees of sensitivity, are they not a vital element in perception? My perception of squalor is different from that of yours. Can you separate perception from the degrees of sensitivity? Perception is not the same to you and me.

Krishnamurti: When I have all these accumulated images, conscious or unconscious, my mind is loaded with them. Where is

the place for sensitivity?

A: Perception is not a passive act of memory. There is always something new which is there with every new perception. With every new response, which I call perception, the factor of degree is inherent. I do not understand why and from where the degree comes, because ignorance is imponderable.

B: Even this seeing is like a camera; it sees its shutters, not the object.

A: I look through the idea; then there is no perception.

Krishnamurti: The mind which is crowded with impressions and information about the object, sees. The mind, the brain, the whole structure is never empty. It is full and through this burden it looks. It looks at you with its associations, with jealousy, pleasure, pain. What is wrong with that?

R: I am never face to face. I see there is sensory perception, then the images, then the like, dislike; those are facts also. They are facts which I do not realize.

Krishnamurti: They are facts, as much as the fact that you are sitting here. Then what takes place? Each time I see you through a screen. What is wrong with that? Is it not a natural process?

SW: In that state I do not see at all.

Krishnamurti: First I want to be clear about this. There are thousands of impressions, thousands of sensory perceptions, thousands of conclusions - let us cover the whole of that by the word "conclusions". Through these conclusions I look, and by looking through these conclusions, they thicken or become faint; they never disappear. Each succeeding sensory perception thickens the same perception. This is the process which is going on all the



time, all through life.

So image-making and conclusion are of the past. Perception is immediate. Sensory perception is immediate and the conclusion becomes the past. So, I am looking at you through the eyes of the past. That is what we are doing. That is a fact. What is wrong with it, Sir? Why should I not look at you that way? What started with perception is not perception at all. Do not condemn it yet. That is what we are doing all the time. I want to be sure before we go any further. Go slow. So, all visual perception is translated in terms of conclusions. Now, what takes place? That is a fact which we all know. That is tradition, is it not? That is experience. Experience, knowledge, tradition, all that is contained in the word "past" and the word "conclusion; and that is the structure and the nature of the brain cells. The brain cells are the past: They retain the memory of the past because in that there is safety - in the biological processes as well as in the psychological accumulations. In that there is tremendous safety.

SW: How is there safety? Am I really safe?

Krishnamurti: Do not question it yet. Look at it. Otherwise you would not know your name, you would not know how to go to Bangalore, recognize your husband or wife. In that tradition, knowledge, experience, conclusions, there is nothing new, therefore there is nothing disturbing, therefore there is the feeling of complete safety. That is absolutely right.

SW: There is nothing to disturb.

Krishnamurti: Anything new is disturbing and as the brain cells need order they find order in the past.

A: But to come back to your question, what is wrong with that?

Krishnamurti: There is nothing wrong in that. I am enquiring into the nature of sensory, visual perception, into the operations of the brain, the mechanism of thought, and how the mind operates; there is safety in sensory perception, image, conclusion, the past. All that is tradition. In tradition there is safety: In the past there is complete security.

SW: Security implies struggle.

Krishnamurti: Security implies the sense of not wanting to be disturbed. I do not know if you have noticed it: the brain needs order. It may establish order in disorder which is neurosis. It needs order and therefore it will find order in disorder and become neurotic. See this?

The brain demands order because in order there is security.

SW: That is perfectly clear.

Krishnamurti: In tradition there is order. In continuity there is order. The brain seeking order creates security, a harbour where it feels safe. And K comes along with revolutionary ideas and tells you, this is not order, and so there is conflict between you and him. You reduce the new in terms of the old and there find safety, security. Why does the mind do this? The Russian revolution and the French revolution upset the whole established structure but soon the brain created order out of disorder, and there was an end to revolution.

A: We have discovered something - that the moment I see something new which creates a disturbance, perception is the instrument by which I convert the new into the old.

Krishnamurti: That is the biological process of the brain. It is a biological necessity for the brain, because in that it finds the most

efficient way of working.

A: Will you examine the inbuilt incapacity of the brain to see and distort the new?

Krishnamurti: Wait, Sir. Unless I see that the brain cells themselves understand the danger of the past, the danger of seeking security in the past, the brain cells will not see anything new. If they see something new they will translate it in terms of the old. Therefore, the brain cells themselves have to see the immense danger of what they consider security in the past.

A: Which means a total change.

Krishnamurti: I do not know a thing. I only see sensory perception, images, conclusions, safety in conclusions. It may be a new conclusion, a disorderly conclusion, but there is safety there; however neurotic it is, in that neuroticism there is safety:

See the beauty of it. This is the truth and that is why it is beautiful. How is the brain which is insistently demanding security, how is that brain to see that in the past there is no security, but always in the new?

The brain cells are seeking security, both in disorder and in order. If you offer a system, a methodological order, the brain accepts it. That is the whole biological process. That is the whole traditional process - security in the past, never in the future, never in the present, but the absolute security in the past. Absolute.

And that is knowledge: biological knowledge, technological knowledge and the knowledge which has been gathered through experience. In knowledge there is security and knowledge is the past. So what is the next question?

SW: There is a modified continuity in this process. This creates

a feeling of progress.

Krishnamurti: The moment you have knowledge it can be continued, modified, but it is still within the field of knowledge; the whole thing is there. What is wrong with this?

SW: All that you say is fact. However, there is another factor. This is not the whole thing: There is something radically wanting in this.

Krishnamurti: What is wanting in this? Go step by step. This is the structure. What is the something which is not quite right? Find out. I will show it to you.

SW: There is no permanency.

Krishnamurti: What are you saying? Knowledge is the most permanent thing. I see knowledge is necessary, and knowledge is the past and thought is the response of the past and so the mind is always living in the past. So the mind is always a prisoner. (Pause)

What does a prisoner talk about? Freedom? Why did you not see it? Being in prison he talks about freedom, moksha, nirvana. He knows his prison is not freedom, but he wants freedom, because in freedom there is joy, there is beauty, there is something happening. His present life is a repetitive, mechanical continuity. So, he has to invent an ideal, he has to invent a moksha, a heaven. There is safety also in the future. Right? So he invents god, he pursues god, truth, enlightenment, but as he invents, he is always anchored to the past. This anchorage is necessary - biologically it is necessary. Can the brain see that knowledge is essential and can the brain see the danger of knowledge which brings about division? Does knowledge bring division? Can it, Sir? Is knowledge the factor that divides?

SW: Yes, of course.

Krishnamurti: Do not agree. "See." Can the brain cells seek security in knowledge, and know that in knowledge there is danger of division?

A: Knowing that knowledge is necessary here....

Krishnamurti: And also knowledge is danger because it divides.

SW: To see both at the same time is difficult.

Krishnamurti: "See" it at the same time. Otherwise you will not "see" it.

A: Knowledge divides what?

Krishnamurti: Knowledge in itself is divisive. The known and the unknown. Yesterday, today and tomorrow. Yesterday, which is the past, the today is modified from yesterday and tomorrow is also modified. In that there is division. Knowledge is the "I know you; in that is the image, the conclusion. But you, in the meantime, have changed. My image of you divides us: Knowledge is security; and can the brain cells seeking security in knowledge know that knowledge at one level is necessary and at another level is divisive and therefore dangerous? The factor of dividing is the building of the image. So can the brain cells see that knowledge is necessary to be physically secure? And can the brain cells see that knowledge based on image derived from conclusion is divisive? Then what next?

SW: There are two types of image-making. In technological knowledge also there is a recording, and that is also a form of image-making.

A: I think we were using the word "image-making" where there is some emotional content. In the other it is not so. As an escape

out of this, the projection of freedom comes.

Krishnamurti: It knows in this there is no freedom and therefore it has to invent a freedom outside the prison.

When you see the whole structure of knowledge, then it is all understood.

A: There is a question which I want to ask: Is it that the mind has a capacity to verbalize something which it does not experience, but would like to experience?

Krishnamurti: We have not yet finished, Sir. Psychological, technological, biological knowledge is included in the word "knowledge". I see, the mind sees, knowledge is divisive and unifying.

In this is the bondage of time. But, the brain cells also know that in this there is no freedom, and they want freedom. In freedom may be the super-security. And that is why man has from immemorial times talked of freedom. But as freedom is not within the prison, man has always thought of freedom outside. And we are saying freedom is here, not outside, right?

SW: Desire for freedom, is it a biological characteristic? The desire for super-security is it also not biological?

Krishnamurti: So, is there freedom in all the things which thought has built including the thought of freedom? Look at it. In this it cannot find freedom. So it says because thought has constructed this freedom within the prison, therefore freedom must be outside.

SW: In other words is there freedom in knowledge?

Krishnamurti: Is there freedom in the past? Knowledge is the past. Knowledge is the accumulation of a million years of

experience. Does experience give freedom? Obviously not. So is there such a thing as freedom?

SW: I do not know. I see freedom is not outside. It is a projection. And yet there is no freedom inside.

Krishnamurti: I do not know. I have always thought of freedom outside. All the religious books, practices, have thought of it over there. There may be absolute freedom here.

I have got it: I know, the brain knows, thought is aware that it has created this prison. All that thought knows is that demanding security, it has created the prison. And it must have security, otherwise it cannot function. So thought enquires where is freedom? It seeks it somewhere where it is perceivable, where it is not projected, not formulated, not invented, where it is not the projection of the past which is still knowledge. Freedom must be somewhere.

A: Is it an act of perception?

Krishnamurti: This is an act of perception. Visually I perceive you. Visual perception has created all this. It is this knowledge that has created all this. Knowledge and non-knowledge are still projections of thought.

R: What is non-knowledge?

A: We say all knowledge, the past is the present and we are thinking of the unknown as freedom.

Krishnamurti: Therefore the unknown is the known. It is very simple now. This is the structure of the brain cells with their memories which are responsible for thought. This is the structure of thought. Thought says knowledge is necessary. Thought says, because you have questioned it, there is no freedom either. So what

is freedom? Is there such a thing at all?

A: We only see that whatever thought produces is not freedom.

Krishnamurti: So, what does it say? Is there security in thought? Thought has created all this. Is there security in the very thinking itself?

SW: It is thinking which has done all this.

Krishnamurti: Therefore, is there security? I have assumed security. I have said I must have knowledge, but is that security? I see wars, divisions, the yours and the mine, the we and the they, my family, your family - is there security in all this?

See what I have found? In knowledge there is security, but not in this which is the result of knowledge. So thought says to itself, is there security in the very structure of thinking itself? Right?

Is there security in the past? Is there security in tradition? Is there security in knowledge? The brain cells have sought security in that, but is there security? The brain cells have to see for themselves that there is no security there. So what happens?

(Pause.) I see there is no security there. It is a tremendous discovery for me. So thought says, what next? I must kill myself, I must destroy myself, because I am the greatest danger.

And now, who is the "I" who is going to destroy itself? So, thought again says, "I must not divide".

SW: Slay the slayer.

Krishnamurti: The prison and the prisoner, the slayer and the slain.

So, is there an ending of "myself" without division? Division means contradiction. Is there an ending of myself without effort? And in that is the quality of sensitivity. To come through all this



and to come to the point requires tremendous subtlety, which is sensitivity. So can thought end by itself?

All this has needed great attention, great awareness; the moving step by step, never missing a thing, that has its own discipline, its own order. The brain now is completely orderly, because it has followed step by step, seeing its own logical attitudes, searching into things that have no security, seeing that it has sought security in division. Now it sees that in division there is no security, therefore, every step is a step in order and that order is its own security.

So, order is perception of things as they are. Perception of what you are, not my conclusion of what you are.

I say perception is seeing things as they are and I cannot see things as they are if I have a conclusion. In conclusion, therefore, there is disorder. Thought has sought security in conclusion which has spread disorder. Therefore it rejects conclusion immediately, because, it wants security. Therefore, thought functions only in knowledge where it is necessary but nowhere else because everywhere else the function of thought is to create conclusions, images. Therefore, thought comes to an end.

**TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 23**  
**RISHI VALLEY 28TH JANUARY 1971**  
**'STABILITY AND KNOWLEDGE'**

Questioner SW: I perceive a tree. Then an idea arises from memory which says this is a mango tree. This idea comes in the way of my looking at the tree and so I am not able to see the fact of the tree. This screen of ideas interferes with the present and there is no real perception.

Krishnamurti: Are you asking, Sir, what is relationship? What is the relationship between the observed and the observer? What does it mean to be related, to be in contact with? Relationship means to be related: the relationship between two people; the relationship between the concept, the ideal and the conceiver, the maker of the ideal; the relationship of the one with the many; the relationship between one thought and another thought and with the interval between thoughts; the relationship between the present and the future as death; the relationship between the world and myself; all that is involved in relationship, is it not? I may renounce the world, I may live in a cave but I am still related to my whole background and the background is "me". I think relationship implies all that.  
(Pause)

A: We always think of relationship in isolation, not as a part of the whole. Relationship is always with something.

Krishnamurti: Can there be a relationship if there is a centre and an observer to which you are related? When the centre feels it is related to something, is that relationship?

A: It has been pointed out that it is only because I feel related to

something that the "I" as the centre is strengthened. The centre assumes a cohesive character only through its fragmented parts.

Krishnamurti: How do we discuss this? Let us see. Where do we begin with this vast subject?

A: Would you start with belief, because belief is the basis of all relationship?

Krishnamurti: What does relationship mean to you?

A: To be in communication.

Krishnamurti: What does relationship mean to you? When you look at me, at her, in what way are you related to me, to her? Are you related?

A: I think so.

Krishnamurti: Let us examine it. I look at you, you look at me. What is our relationship? Is there relationship at all except a verbal relationship?

R: There is a feeling of relationship when there is a movement towards something.

Krishnamurti: If both of us are moving towards an ideal, going together to a point, is that relationship? Can there be relationship when each one is in isolation?

SW: The first question you asked was, can there be relationship if there is a centre?

Krishnamurti: If I have built a wall around myself, consciously or unconsciously, a wall of resistance, of self-protection in order to be secure, in order not to get hurt, to be safe, is there any relationship at all? Do look at this. I am afraid, because I have been hurt physically as well as psychologically and my whole being is wounded and I do not want to be hurt any more. I build a wall

around myself, of resistance, of defence, of "I know, you do not know", to feel completely safe from being further hurt. In that what is my relationship to you? Is there any relationship?

A: What do you mean by relationship in our daily normal life?

Krishnamurti: Why do you ask me? Look at yourself. In your normal, daily life, what takes place? There is the going to the office, being bullied, insulted by someone at the top. That is your relationship. With your wounded pride you come home and your wife says you are this, you are that, and you further withdraw and you sleep with her - have you any relationship?

A: That means when the centre is there, there is no relationship at all.

R: But there is ordinary goodwill.

Krishnamurti: But is there goodwill if I have got this wall of resistance, this enclosure within which I live? What is my goodwill towards you? I am polite. I keep a distance. I am always inside the wall.

SW: Even in the life of an ordinary man, there are some relationships which are not always from behind a wall.

A: You say there is no relationship. The fact is I am related in this way because of a feeling of commitment. There is commitment to one another. I am not acting in self-interest, but only in the interest of the other.

Krishnamurti: You say I am acting in the interest of the other; is that so? I follow the leader who hopes to revolutionize society, inwardly and outwardly, and I follow him and obey. I commit myself to a course of action, which both the leader and I have agreed as necessary. Is there a relationship between me and the

leader who is working for the same end? What does relationship mean: to be in contact with, to be in close proximity?

A: The crux of this relationship is utility.

Krishnamurti: Our relationship is based on a utilitarian relationship.

R: I see if you apply this test, that there is no relationship.

Krishnamurti: You are not answering the deeper issue, which is, as long as there is the observer who is committing himself to a course of action, is there a relationship between you and me? A: Is relationship then only an idea?

Krishnamurti: An idea, a formula, a pattern, a goal, a principle, an utopia we both agree upon, but is there a relationship?

A: Is there no relationship between two people?

Krishnamurti: It is really an enormous problem. As I said, what is relationship between one thought and another, one action and another? Or is action a continuous movement, and therefore in action there is no linking and, therefore, one action is not related to another? Look, Sir, am I related when I look at that tree?

Relationship is a distance between me as the observer and the tree. The distance may be 5'-2" or a 100 yards, but where there is the distance between the observer and the observed, is there any possibility of relationship? I am married and I have built an image of my wife and she has built an image of me. The image is the factor of distance. Is there any relationship with my wife except the physical? All of us co-operate in order to do something. To do something brings us together but I have my own worries, she has her own agonies - we are working together in that but are we related, though we are working together for an idea?

A: Sir, this point of working together has been understood but not the other.

Krishnamurti: Just a minute. To build the rocket, I believe, it took three hundred thousand people, each man technologically working to create the perfect mechanism. They built a perfect rocket and each man put aside his idiosyncracies and there was what is called co-operation. Is that co-operation? You and I work in order to build a house. We both have a common motive, but you and I are separate human beings. Is that co-operation? When I look at a tree, there is distance between me and the tree and I am not in relationship with the tree. That distance is created, not by physical space, but the distance created by knowledge.

Therefore, what is relationship, what is co-operation, what is the factor of division?

SW: Images in one form or another divide.

Krishnamurti: Go slow. There is that tree. I look at it. The physical distance between me and that tree may be a few yards, but the actual distance between me and that tree is vast. Though I look at it, my eyes, mind, heart, everything is very very far away. That distance is incalculable.

In the same way, I look at my wife and I am very far away. In the same way I am very far away in co-operative action.

SW: Is the word, the image, interfering in all this?

Krishnamurti: We are going to find out. There is the word, the image, and the goal towards which both are co-operating. What is dividing is the goal. What is dividing you and me is the goal.

SW: But there is no goal with regard to the tree.

Krishnamurti: Just stay there. Do not jump. We think working

for a goal together has brought us in contact. In fact the goal is separating us. A: No. How can you say the goal is dividing us?

Krishnamurti: I do not know. I may be wrong. We are investigating. You and I have a goal; we work together.

SW: Is it a question of becoming?

Krishnamurti: Do look at it. I say goals divide people. A goal does not bring people together. Your goal and my goal are separate; they have divided us. The goal itself has divided us, not co-operation, which is irrelevant to the goal.

SW: I see one thing, where two people come together for the joy of something, that is different.

Krishnamurti: No. When two people come together out of affection, love, joy, then what is action which is not divisible, which does not divide? I love you, you love me and what is action out of that love? Not a goal? What is action between two people who love?

A: When two people come together in affection it may produce a result but they are not coming together for the result. Therefore, in any such coming together there is no division. Whereas if two people come together with a goal, that is a divisive factor.

Krishnamurti: We have discovered something. Do go into it. I see that when people come together with affection when there is no goal, no purpose, no utopia - then there is no division. Then all status disappears and there is only function - then I will sweep the garden because it is part of the needs of the place.

R: Love of the place....

Krishnamurti: No, love. Not love of the place. You see what we are missing. Goals divide people; a goal being a formula, a goal

being an ideal.

I want to see what is involved. I see what is involved. I see as long as I have a goal, a purpose, a principle, an utopia, I see that very goal, that very principle divides people. Therefore, it is finished. Then I ask myself how I am to live, to work with you and without a goal?

I see that relationship means to be in close contact so that there is no distance between the two. Right? And I see that in the relationship to the tree and myself, the flower and myself, my wife and myself, there is a physical distance and there is a vast psychological distance. Therefore, I see I am not related at all.

So what am I going to do? So I say identify with the tree. Commit yourself with the family; give yourself over; de-own yourself in the goal and work together. All the intellectuals say the goal is more important than you, the whole is greater than you, so give yourself over, be completely involved with your wife, with the tree, with the world.

What am I doing? I love nature. I commit myself to the world of nature, to the family and to an idea that we must all work together, for an end. What is happening, what am I doing in all this?

SW: Isolating myself. Krishnamurti: No, Sir, look at what is happening.

A: The fact is I am not related. I struggle to build a relationship, to bridge the gap between thought and thought. I have got to build this bridge between thought and thought because unless I do this, I feel absolutely isolated. I feel lost.

Krishnamurti: That is only a part of it. Go into it a little more. What is happening to my mind, when my mind is struggling to



commit itself to everything - to family, to nature, to beauty, to working together?

SW: There is a lot of conflict there, Sir.

Krishnamurti: I realize as "A" has pointed out, I am not related to anything. I have come to that point. Then, not being related to anything, I want to be related, therefore, I commit myself, therefore, I involve myself in action and yet the isolation goes on. So, what is going on in my mind?

SW: Death.

R: There is a constant struggle.

Krishnamurti: You see you have not moved away from that point. I am not related and then I try to be related. I try to identify myself through action. Now what is taking place in the mind? (Pause.) I am moving into peripheral commitment. What happens to my mind when it moves on the outside all the time?

SW: The mind gets strengthened.

A: I am escaping from myself.

Krishnamurti: Which means what? Do look at it. Nature becomes very important, the family becomes very important, the action to which I have completely given myself over becomes all important and what has happened to me? It has completely externalized everything. Now, what has happened to the mind that has externalized the whole movement of relationship? What happens to your mind when it is occupied with the external, with the periphery?

SW: It has lost all sensitivity.

Krishnamurti: Do look at what happens inside you. In reaction to the externalization, you withdraw, you become a monk. What

happens to the mind when it withdraws?

SW: I am incapable of spontaneity.

Krishnamurti: You will find the answer. Look in there. (Pause)

What happens to your mind when you withdraw or when you are committed? What happens when you withdraw into your own conclusions? It is another world. Instead of one world, you create another world which you call the inner world.

SW: The mind is not free.

Krishnamurti: Is that what is happening to your mind?

A: It is always committed.

Krishnamurti: The mind is committed to the outward phenomena and the reaction to that is the inward commitment, the withdrawal. The inward commitment is the reaction of your own world of imagination, of mystical experience. What happens to the mind that is doing this?

R: It is occupied.

Krishnamurti: Is that what is going on? She says it is occupied, is that all? Put your guts into it. The mind externalizes its activity and then withdraws and acts. What happens to the quality of the mind, to the brain which is withdrawing and externalizing?

A: It does not face the fact.

R: There is a great fear. It becomes dull.

SW: It is not free to look.

Krishnamurti: Have you watched your mind when it is externalizing all action outwardly and all action inwardly? It is the same movement - the outer and inner. It is like a tide going out and coming in. It is so simple is it not? What happens to the mind going out, coming in?

A: It becomes mechanical.

Krishnamurti: It is a mind that is completely without any bearing, completely unstable, a mind that has no order. It becomes neurotic, unbalanced, disproportionate, inharmonious, destructive, because there is no stability in the whole movement.

A: It is restless.

Krishnamurti: Therefore, there is no stability. Therefore what happens? It invents another outside action or withdraws. And the brain needs order, order means stability. It tries to find order out there in relationship and does not find it; so it withdraws and tries to find order within and again is caught in the same process. Is this a fact? (Pause)

The mind tries to find stability in co-operative action about something. The mind tries to find stability in the family, in commitment and does not find it and so translates, seeks relationship with nature, becomes imaginative, romantic which again breeds instability. It withdraws into a world of infinite conclusions, utopias, hopes and again there is no stability and, therefore, it invents an order in that. The mind being unstable, narrow, not rooted in anything, gets lost. Is that what is happening to you?

R: That explains the cult of the beautiful.

Krishnamurti: Cult of beautiful, cult of the ugly, cult of the hippies.

Is that what is happening to your mind?

Be there. Do not accept what I am saying.

So, a mind that is not stable, in the sense of firm, deeply rooted in order, not an invented order - for an invented order must be

death; such a mind is the most destructive mind. It goes from communism to the guru, to Yoga Vashista, to Ramana Maharishi and back again. It is caught in the cult of the beautiful, the cult of the ugly, the cult of devotion, of meditation and so on.

How is the mind to be completely still? From that stillness, action is entirely different. See the beauty of it, Sir. A: That is the dead-end of the mind.

Krishnamurti: No, Sir. I am asking myself, how is this mind to be completely still? Not stability in the sense of hardness, but a stability that is flexible. A mind that is completely stable, firm, deep, has its roots in infinity. How is that possible? Then what is the relationship with the tree, with the family, with the committee?

I realize my mind is unstable and I understand what it means. I know now for myself, I have understood for myself that this movement is born of instability. I know that and so I negate that. And I ask what is stability? I know instability with all its activity, with all its destruction and when I put that away completely, what is stability? I sought stability in family, in work, and I have also inwardly sought stability in withdrawal, in experience, in knowledge, in my capacity, in God. I see I do not know what stability is.

The not knowing is the stable.

The man who says "I know" and therefore, "I am stable" has led us to this chaos.

The people who say we are the chosen ones, the vast number of teachers, gurus have said "I know".

Rejecting all that, rely on yourself. Have confidence in yourself. And when the mind puts away all this, when it has understood

what is not stable and that it cannot know what is true stability, then there is a movement of flexibility, of harmony, because the mind does not know.

The truth of not-knowing is the only factor from which one can move.

The truth of that is the stable. A mind that does not know is in a state of learning. The moment I say I have learnt, I have stopped learning and that stopping is the stability of division.

So, "I do not know". The truth is "I do not know". That is all. And that gives you a quality of learning and in learning there is stability. Stability is in the "I am learning, not I have learnt". See what it does to the mind. It completely unburdens the mind and that is freedom; the freedom of not-knowing. See the beauty of it - the not-knowing, therefore, freedom. Now what happens to the brain which functions in knowledge? That is its function, is it not? To function from memory to memory. In knowledge the mind has found tremendous security and biologically that security is necessary. Otherwise it cannot survive. Now, what happens to the brain that says I really do not know anything except the biological knowledge of survival? What happens to the rest of the brain? The rest of the brain before was tethered. Now it is not occupied. It will act but it is not occupied.

That brain has never been touched. It is no longer capable of being hurt. There is a new brain born or the old brain is purged of its occupations.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 24 BOMBAY 6TH FEBRUARY 1971 'THE BRAIN- CELLS AND MUTATION'**

Questioner P: We have not dealt so far with what seems to be the essence of your teaching and that is the problem of time, the silencing of the brain cells and what happened to the processes that operated in Krishnamurti. I am putting the three together because as one observes the horizontal movement of time, that is the life of K, one sees the boy born with his tradition of Brahminism, going through a certain preparation in the Theosophical Society, being initiated, writing certain books like *The Search* and *The Path*; books in which enlightenment is looked upon as an end, as a fixed point. In all these earlier books there is presumed to be a state which has to be reached and there is a great struggle through centuries towards it. Suddenly a change takes place in K; he negates salvation, eternity as a fixed point and so destroys the horizontal movement of time as such. Now what exactly took place? If we could understand and see as if through a microscope what happened to Krishnamurti, if we could examine what happened to his brain cells which contained this horizontal movement of time, it might be possible for us to understand time and mutation in relation to the brain cells.

Krishnamurti: I understand. Do you understand, Sir?

D: Yes Sir. A very important question.

Krishnamurti: I wonder if that so-called horizontal movement was not a very conditioned and superficial movement? The young man, repeated what he was taught and at a given moment, there

was a break. You follow?

P: No, I do not. What is meant by a superficial movement of conditioning?

Krishnamurti: That is, the boy accepted, repeated, walked along the path laid down traditionally and theosophically. He accepted it.

P: All of us do just that.

Krishnamurti: All of us do it in varying degrees. The question is why did he pursue that journey?

P: No. The question is what was it that triggered that which suddenly made him say that there is no fixed point?

Krishnamurti: Look at it as if "K" is not here. He is dead. How would you answer this question. I am here and so may answer you or may not, but if I were not here how would you answer it? P: One way of doing so would be to examine what you have said, along with the influences which have operated on you, at the time, to see at what point the break took place and what were the crises, inward or outward, that have been recorded, to produce that break.

Krishnamurti: But suppose you knew nothing of all that, and yet you had to answer the question seriously now, what would you do? What you say would take time, investigation. How would you find out now? How would you find out if you were faced with this problem that there was a young man who followed the traditional path, the idea of a fixed point, the fixed goal, using time, evolution, and at a given point he broke away. How would you unravel it?

D: It is like this. We boil water under heat. Up to a hundred degrees it is uniform and then there is complete transformation.

Krishnamurti: But to come to that point takes time.

P: If I did not have the historical background, the only way of

investigation would be to see whether this process is possible within my consciousness.

D: I was driving at something else. The traditionalist would say there is a process which, like the boiling point of water, leads to transformation. Tradition only helps to take you up to the boiling point. You can negate tradition but the necessity of tradition up to a point is there.

P: If the historical data were not available of "K" being put through various sadhanas and one were just given the fact of this phenomenon of "K", the only way to investigate would be through self-knowing.

D: How would you explain the phenomenon?

F: You seem to be creating a relationship between the former state of development and the present state of being. Is there a relationship between the two? You say one leads to another, one before another and you are arranging it in time.

P: The phenomenon of "K" is that he was born of Brahmin parents...the whole history we know. I look at his background, I notice that up to a point K talked of time, of salvation as a final point and suddenly the whole thing was negated.

Krishnamurti: "F" says why do you relate this movement, the horizontal movement to the vertical movement? There is no relationship between the two. Therefore keep the two separate.

P: When I look at "K", I look at the whole background.

Krishnamurti: Look but do not relate the two.

P: The question is if what you say has to be meaningful, it is essential to understand this process of time and the freedom from it. I therefore ask the question: What triggered it in you? If you tell



me it happened, I will say all right. If it happens, it happens, if it does not, it does not. I will continue my life.

F: There is no trigger.

P: A certain brain made certain noises and suddenly started making other noises and "K" has been saying the brain cells themselves are time. Do not let us get away from that. So the brain cells of "K" which were time, underwent some kind of mutation.

Krishnamurti: I will show you very simply. The cultivation of a brain, of any brain takes time. Experience, knowledge and memories are stored up in the brain cells. This is a biological fact. The brain is the result of time. Now this man at a point breaks the movement. A totally different movement takes place, which means, the brain cells themselves undergo mutation. And "P" says you must answer and say what took place; otherwise what happened was merely chance.

D: If it is chance, then we will accept it.

B: An answer by Krishnaji may help us to bring about a mutation in ourselves.

S: Two explanations are possible. One is the theosophical explanation that the Masters were looking after "K" and so he was untouched by experience. Another explanation is that of reincarnation.

D: When "K" says that the boy K was not touched by experience, how does he know? The boy wrote The Path, The Search; I will not go into the end product where he was not touched.

Krishnamurti: Just leave that for the moment. How did it happen? What is your answer? Given these facts, faced with them,

how do you answer this?

B: Sir, how can we answer the change in you which took place in 1927? Mrs Besant has said that the two consciousnesses would not be merged. We do not know. You alone can say what took place. We have no personal knowledge nor the capacity to know.

Krishnamurti: Let us investigate it together.

F: I will put it this way. The man woke up into another state. If you posit a causal link between the past and the present then what you say is so. One does not lead to another. There is no connection.

P: I say the brain cells themselves cannot comprehend time which is not a horizontal movement. Unless this is understood, we cannot explore at very great depth into the problem of time.

Krishnamurti: Let us explore. First of all, is there time involved at all?

If you ask me how did this happen to me, I really do not know. You understand? But I think we can investigate it together. If you ask me "did you go for a walk last night?" I would say yes. Whereas if you ask me "how did this happen to you?", I really could not say how. What is wrong with that?

P: In itself, it is all right. But we are trying to comprehend the essential nature of this time movement and non-time movement - leave yourself out of it, it is important that we investigate into the nature of time, not at the level of chronological time and psychological time for we have gone into that sufficiently.

Krishnamurti: Begin with perception; is seeing involved with time?

P: What happens to the brain cells in the process of seeing?

Krishnamurti: The brain cells in the process of seeing, either

respond in old terms or are held back in abeyance; they hold themselves back in abeyance without the past.

P: You say that in perception which is instantaneous, the brain cells hold back. If they are not operating, do they exist?

Krishnamurti: They do, as the storehouse of knowledge which is the past. The brain cells, we all agree, are the storehouse of memories, experience, knowledge which is the past. That is the old brain. In perception, the old brain does not respond.

P: Where is it?

Krishnamurti: It is there. It is not dead. It is there because I have to use knowledge to think. The brain cells have to be used.

P: What operates then? If the brain cells are not operating, what is operating?

Krishnamurti: A totally new brain. The old brain is full of images, memories, responses and we are used to responding with the old brain. You say perception is not related to the old brain. Perception is the interval between the old response and the response which is new, which the old does not yet know. In that interval there is no time.

F: There is a contradiction. In psychology, sensation is itself direct. In the interval between sensation and perception, memories jump in and distort. So sensation is timeless but the interval is time.

Krishnamurti: Let us get this clear. You ask me a question. The old brain responds according to its information, according to knowledge; if the old brain has no knowledge, no information, there is an interval between the question and answer.

F: The interval is due to the sluggishness of the brain cells.

Krishnamurti: No.

F: Memory traces continue in the brain.

Krishnamurti: You ask me what the distance is between here and Delhi. I would not know. No amount of my thinking with the brain cells would help. The fact is not registered. If it were, I would then think about it and answer. But there is no knowing. In that no-knowing, there is a state in which time does not exist.

D: No amount of waiting will make me know.

Krishnamurti: The moment I know, the knowing is time.

P: You have said two or three things; you have talked of a new mind. The question is what has happened to the old brain?

Krishnamurti: The old is quiet.

P: Has it existence?

Krishnamurti: Of course it has; otherwise I cannot speak the language.

P: The problem is of time as a horizontal movement which has continuity - I am asking the question; the moment you say the other continues to exist -

Krishnamurti: Otherwise, I cannot function. P: When the new exists, the other, the old, does not.

Krishnamurti: Perfectly right. Hold on for a moment. Let us call it for convenience sake, the old and the new brain. The old brain has, through centuries, collected all kinds of memories, registered every experience and it will function on that level all the time. It has its continuity in time. If it has no continuity, then it becomes neurotic, schizophrenic, imbalanced. It must have sane, rational continuity. Now that is the old brain with all its stored-up memories. Such continuity can never find anything new because it is only when something ends, that there is something new.

F: Continuity of what? When you say continuity, it has a movement.

Krishnamurti: It is adding, taking away, adjusting; it is not static.

D: There is a circular movement; it is a continuity.

Krishnamurti: First let me see this continuity, the circular movement, as a repetition of the old. At a given point of time I call it the new, but it is still the old. I hanker for the new and invent the new within the circle.

P: There is the new which is a rearrangement of the old and there is the 'new', which is not a rearrangement of the old. What is the other new which is not the invention of the old? Is it recognizable, is it perceivable?

Krishnamurti: It is perceivable but not recognizable.

P: So it is not an experience?

Krishnamurti: It is a perception without the observer.

D: But not in terms of the past.

Krishnamurti: Perception means something new.

F: Sensation is without the past. Sensation is not loaded. It is direct.

Krishnamurti: The mind which has become mechanical craves for something new. But the new is always within the field of the known. You may call the movement within the field, horizontal, circular, infinity, but it is always within that field: I want the new in terms of the old. "P"'s question was about the brain, which is the result of time, experience, knowledge; what happens to that brain when there is a perception which is new, in which there is no experience, no observer; in which perception is not an experience

to be stored up and remembered and therefore to become knowledge.

F: The brain does not respond:

Krishnamurti: What makes it not respond? How does this happen?

P: We should leave everything and remain here, because something of vital significance is happening here. We have still not got the feeling of it. I am listening to you. I am attentive. In that state of attention there is nothing else but sound and movement. Can I understand in that state what has happened to the whole weight of the past?

Krishnamurti: It is fairly simple. I understand the question. The past is in continuous operation; it is registering every incident, every experience, the conscious and the unconscious: Everything is pouring in, the sound, the seeing: P: The brain cells are acting independent of whether I am conscious or unconscious.

Krishnamurti: Yes. Now when that brain is in operation, it is always acting from the past. First of all, what is wrong with it?

P: If you observe it, it is like ripples being thrown up, thought as ripples, and suddenly I am attentive and there are no ripples.

Krishnamurti: In that state of attention, there is perception. That state of attention is perception.

D: When I see the fact that my brain is registering everything and I suddenly realize that it is going on without the observer, that annihilates me. If it goes on without me then I am finished.

Krishnamurti: It is like a recording machine that is registering everything:

D: Why do I need to call it a machine? It is a wondrous thing.

And I do not know the why and how of it.

Krishnamurti: You have heard that noise of the horn blowing. The brain cells have registered it. There is no resistance or acceptance.

D: There is more to it.

Krishnamurti: Go slow: This brain is a machine which registers. It is a tape-recorder that is registering everything all the time. You come along and challenge the brain. It will respond in terms of like, of dislike, you are a danger and she is not a danger. In that instant is born the "me".

It is the function of the brain to register:

D: That is a partial statement. That it registers is a fact but there may be something more to it.

Krishnamurti: You are jumping ahead. The function of the brain is to register, to record. Every experience, whether conscious or unconscious, every sound, word, every nuance, is going on irrespective of the thinker as a separate entity. Resisting that noise which is unpleasant, listening to some flattery, to some insult, wanting more or less - out of this registration emerges the "me".

P: When the registration takes place, I am conscious of the sound.

Krishnamurti: Which is what? That it is pleasant or unpleasant. At the moment of experiencing, there is no "I" in it at all.

P: There is a state with the sound and there is a state without the sound:

Krishnamurti: Now comes the new action. I register that noise - the hideous noise, the ugly noise - there is no response to it. The moment there is response, that response is the "I". That response

increases or decreases according to pleasure, pain, suffering.

Now, "P"s question was how is that brain which is doing all this automatically, mechanically, all the time, how is that old brain whether it is running horizontally or in circles, how is that brain ever to see without the registerer or registration?

P: We have gone over this. I want to take it further from there. We listen. Sound passes through us. There is attention. In that state, for a second, horizontal movement has come to an end. What has happened to the old brain?

Krishnamurti: But it is still there.

P: What do you mean it is still there?

Krishnamurti: Look at it. See what has happened. There is that child crying. The sound is being registered, the child's cry, why the mother does not look after it, all the rest of it.

P: Do you record all that?

Krishnamurti. No. I am purely listening. There is complete listening. Now what happens in that listening? What has happened to the old brain in that listening? Have you understood the question? We are taking the journey together. (Pause)

Let me put it differently. What is the essential need of a brain?  
(Pause)

Must it not feel safe, secure, to function?

One sees the brain needs security. Then some event happens and the brain sees the fact that to have presumed that there was security, comfort is not true.

D: The brain cannot see it.

F: We take the brain as an accumulation of impressions and storehouse of memories and so on, but the storehouse of memories



is outside the brain and the brain is only a lens.

P: Why do we not observe our own minds at this moment, instead of talking of the brain in the abstract?

Krishnamurti: Listen - your brain demands security; it needs a great sense of protection, both physical and psychological. That is all I am saying. That is its function. That is the essential point.

D: What is the basic query?

P: The basic query is that when there is this horizontal movement of the mind as time, as memory, as brain cells operating, what is it that makes the "other" possible and what takes place when the "other" is?

Krishnamurti: I will tell you. The brain cells need security, protection, safety to survive. They have survived for millions of years. Now what takes place? In order to survive, the brain cells say I must have nationalities, which brings disaster. So in its search for security, the mind is always experimenting and gets stuck - the guru, nationalism, socialism - it gets stuck and has to be rooted out. Because the basic thing is that it wants safety and survival and therefore it has invented a time sequence of survival - horizontal or circular. When the basic necessity is granted, what happens? Is the perception in terms of security not entirely different?

D: It is the demand for security that resists the question you are asking.

Krishnamurti. No, I have got my security. So far for seventy years it has not been damaged because it says survival, not at the price of illusion. It says do not invent beliefs or ideas for in them there is no security at all. Wipe them out because they are illusory. Therefore it is completely secure; not in anything, but in itself it is

secure. Before it sought security through something - through family, through god, egotism, competition, through seeking. Security through something is the greatest insecurity. It discards that. Therefore it can perceive. Because it has no illusions, motives, formulas, it can perceive. Because it does not seek any security, it is completely secure. The mind is then free of illusions; illusion not in the sense of Sankara, but just the illusion that I will find security in family, in God, in knowledge which is the past.

Now what is there to perceive? "It" is perceiving.

F: We are as we are made; we know we are at the mercy of the psychosomatic body and there we are very insecure. And there has to be a different approach to this. It is something very vulnerable because our bodies are so fragile.

Krishnamurti: So I will protect the body. There is no egotism involved in it.

F: Vulnerability is connected with ego.

Krishnamurti: I will protect the body without the ego. I will wash it, look after it. We think we protect the body through the "I". Once we grant deeply the necessity for complete survival, for protection, for safety for the brain, we will solve all the other problems. Let us put it in this way: Is perception related to the brain cells which demand security, survival at any price?

P: My mind does not function in this way. Therefore I find it very difficult to listen. I am trying to work at a microscopic examination of the mind to see whether it is possible to arrive at a point when actually the brain cells cease functioning. Questions of security or of non-security have no relevance. At this moment if I raise these questions I am lost. Here I am before you and I want to

understand this movement of time which is horizontal, to see whether there can be a state of the brain cells ceasing to function. Any queries, questions, answers, away from this will only lead to confusion.

Krishnamurti: Are you saying, having finished with what we have said, my brain cells are in perpetual movement in one form or another?

P: I say I am listening to you. There is no movement in my mind.

Krishnamurti: Why? Because you are listening with attention, attention in which there is no centre to attend, a state in which you are just attending?

P: Now I ask in that state, where is the weight of the past? I am asking that question to understand the problem of time, and not anything else.

Krishnamurti: When you say I am attending, giving complete attention, is there time in that?

P: Because there is no response, how do I measure?

Krishnamurti: When there is attention, there is no time, because there is no movement at all. Movement means measurement, comparison; from here to there and so on. In attention there is no ripple, there is no centre, there is no measurement. The next question is, what has happened to the old brain? Keep it there. It is your question. What has happened? (Pause.) I have got it. What has happened? Attention is not disassociated from the brain. Attention is the whole body. The psychosomatic organism is attentive, which is also the brain cells. Therefore, the brain cells are exceedingly quiet, alive, not responding with the old. Otherwise you could not

be attentive.

There is the answer. And in that attention the brain can function. That attention is silence, is emptiness; call it what you like. Out of that silence, innocence, emptiness, the brain can operate; but not the thinker in terms of seeking security in something.

P: Does it mean the whole brain has undergone a transformation?

Krishnamurti: No. What has taken place is mutation. The observer is not.

P: But the brain cells are the same.

Krishnamurti: Watch it. Do not put it that way; then you are lost. Watch it in yourself. Attention means complete attention - body, psyche, the cells; everything is there with life, alive. In that state, there is no centre, there is no time, there is no observer as the "me". There is no time in terms of the past but yet the past exists because I speak the language. I have to go to the room. Right?

Then what happens to the brain cells? They are registering but there is no "me". Therefore the "me" which is part of the brain cells is wiped out.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 25 BOMBAY 9TH FEBRUARY 1971 'GOD'**

Questioner P: Krishnaji, at one level, your teaching is very materialistic because it refuses to accept anything which does not have a referent. It is based on "what is". You have even gone so far as to say that consciousness is the brain cells and that nothing else exists. And that thought is matter, and nothing else exists.

Now in terms of this, what is your attitude to God?

Krishnamurti: I do not know what you mean by materialistic and God?

P: You have said, thought is matter, the brain cells themselves are consciousness. Now these are material things, measurable, and in that sense yours would be part of a materialistic position, in the tradition of the "Lokayatas". In terms of your teaching what place has God? Is God matter?

Krishnamurti: Do you understand clearly the word "material"?

P: Material is that which is measurable.

F: There is no such thing as the material, "P".

P: Brain is matter.

F: No, it is energy. Everything is energy but that energy is not observable. You can only see the effects of energy which you call matter. The effects of energy appear as matter.

D: When she says matter, she probably means energy. Energy and matter are convertible, but still measurable.

Krishnamurti: That is, you are saying matter is energy and energy is matter. You cannot divide them to say this is pure energy and this is pure matter.

D: The material is the expression or appearance of energy.

F: What we call matter is nothing but energy. It is only energy as apprehended by the senses of perception. There is no such thing as matter. It is only a way of talking.

D: Energy is  $E$  equal to  $Mc^2$ .

P: You see Krishnaji, if we go into any aspect of your teaching, it is based on that which is observable. The instruments of hearing, of seeing, are within the field of sensory apprehension. Even though you may talk of not naming, that which is observable is through the instruments of seeing, listening. The instruments of the senses are the only instruments we have with which to observe.

Krishnamurti: We know sensory seeing, sensory hearing, sensory touching and the intellect which is part of the whole structure. Now what is the question?

P: In that sense, the teaching is materialistic as opposed to the metaphysical. Your position is a materialistic position.

F: If you want to stick to facts, the only instrument we have is the brain. Now, is the brain everything or is it an instrument in the hands of somebody else? If you say there is only brain, it will be a materialistic position. If you say the instrument is materialistic then the teaching is not materialistic.

P: The Tantrik position and the ancient alchemist position are in one sense similar to Krishnaji's position. Everything has to be observed. There is nothing that has to be accepted that has not been seen with the eyes of the seer. Seeing this I now ask, "what is your view of God". I feel it is a very legitimate question.

F: Can you explain what God is?

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by God? We have explained

energy and matter and now you ask what we mean by God? I never use the word "God" to indicate something which is not God. What thought has invented is not God. If it is invented by thought, it is still within the field of time, within the field of the material.

P: Thought says I cannot go further.

Krishnamurti: But it may invent God because it cannot go further. Thought knows its limitations. Therefore, knowing its limitations, it tries to invent the limitless which it calls God. That is the position.

P: When thought sees its limitations, it is still aware of an existence beyond itself.

Krishnamurti: Thought has invented it. It can only go beyond when thought comes to an end.

P: Seeing the limitations of thought is not the knowing of thought.

Krishnamurti: So we must go into the knowing of thought and not God.

D: When thought sees its own limitation, it practically debunks it.

Krishnamurti: When you say limitation, does thought realize it is limited or does the thinker realize that thought is limited? You see the point. Or does the thinker who is the product of thought realize it?

P: Why do you draw the distinction?

Krishnamurti: Thought has created the thinker. If thought did not exist, there would be no thinker. Does the thinker, observing the limitations, say "I am limited" or does thought itself realize its limitations which are two different positions. Let us be clear in all

this. We are exploring. There are the two - the thought and thinker. The thinker, observing thought, sees through reasoning which is the material, which is energy, that energy is limited. In the realm of thought, the thinker thinks this.

D: When the thinker says thought is limited, both the thought and the thinker become question-marks. Krishnamurti: No, not yet. Thought is memory, thought is the response of knowledge. Thought has brought about this thing called the thinker. The thinker then becomes separate from thought; at least it thinks it is separate from thought. The thinker, looking at reasoning, at the intellect, at the capacity to rationalize, sees that it is very very limited. Therefore, the thinker condemns reason; the thinker says thought is very limited, which is condemnation. Then he says there must be something more than thought, something beyond this limited field. That is what we are doing. We are taking things as they are. Does the thinker think that thought is limited or does thought itself realize it is limited? I do not know if you see the difference.

F: Thought is prior to the thinker.

P: Thought can end. Thought can never feel it is limited. Thought can end - through what reason, do not ask. There is no real reason but thought can end. But how does thought feel it is limited?

Krishnamurti: That is my point. Does the thinker see he is limited or does thought say, I cannot go any further? You see the point?

F: Why do you separate the thinker from the thought? There are many thoughts out of which the thinker is also another thought.



The thinker is the guide, helper, censor; he is the most dominant thing.

Krishnamurti: Thought has gone through all this and established a centre from which there is the observer, and the observer looking at thought says thought is limited.

D: In fact, it can only say "I do not know".

Krishnamurti: It does not say that. You are introducing a non-observable fact. First of all, thought is the response of knowledge, thought has not yet realized that it is very limited. What it has done in order to have security, is to put together various thoughts which have become the observer, the thinker, the experiencer. Then we are asking the question: Does the thinker realize that it is limited, or thought itself realizes it is limited? The two are entirely different.

F: We know only a state of thinker thinking thought.

Krishnamurti: That is all we know. Therefore, the thinker invariably says we must go beyond thought; therefore it questions: Can one kill the mind? Does God exist?

F: You are giving existence to the thinker instead of thought.

Krishnamurti: The thinker is modifying, adding. The thinker is not a permanent entity as thought is not permanent, but the thinker is adjusting, modifying.

This is important. I may be mistaken. It is important to find out whether the thinker sees it is limited or whether thought as idea - idea being organized thought - thinks it is limited.

Now, who says it? If the thinker says it is limited, then the thinker says there must be something more. Then the thinker says there must be God, there must be something beyond thinking.

Right? If thought itself realizes it cannot go beyond its own tether, beyond its own rooted brain cells, the brain cells as the material, as the root of thinking; if thought realizes that, then what takes place?

P: You see, Sir, that is the whole point. If you were to leave your teaching at this point, I would understand. If you were to leave it at this point, that thought itself sees this, the brain cells themselves see it and leave it, then there is a total consistency and logic; but you are always moving, going beyond this and you cannot use any words. Thereafter call it what you like, but the feeling of God is introduced.

Krishnamurti: I won't accept the word "God".

P: You take us by reason, by logic to a point. You do not leave it there.

Krishnamurti: Of course not.

P: That is the real paradox.

Krishnamurti: I refuse to accept it as a paradox.

F: The material of something and the meaning cannot be interchanged. "P" is mixing up the two.

Krishnamurti: It is fairly simple what she says: The thinker and the thought - we can see the whole logic of that, of what you say, but you do not leave it there. You push it further.

P: Into an abstraction. I say that thought and the thinker being essentially one, man has separated them for his own safety, permanency, security. We are asking the question whether the thinker thinks thought is limited and therefore posits something beyond, because he must have security; or does thought say that whatever movement however subtle, however obvious, reasonable, thought is still limited. But K does not say that. K goes further into

abstractions.

Krishnamurti: I realize that thought and the thinker are very very limited and I do not stop there. To do so would be a purely materialistic philosophy. That is what many intellectuals in the east and west have come to. But they are always tethered, and being tethered, they expand but remain tied to a pole which is their experience, their belief.

Now, if I can answer the question - does thought itself realize the limitations of itself, then what takes place? Knowing thought is energy, thought is memory, thought is the past, thought is time, suffering, then what takes place? It realizes that any movement of thought is consciousness, is the content of consciousness, and without the content there is no consciousness. Now what takes place? Is that observable or not? I do not invent God.

P: I do not say that. I never said you invent God. I say up to this point your position is material, rational, logical; suddenly you introduce another element.

Krishnamurti: No. Look at it. Thought itself realizes - not the thinker who thinks it cannot and therefore posits super-consciousness, a higher self, God or whatever it will - but thought itself realizes that any movement it makes is within the field of time. Then what happens? Then thought becomes completely silent - this is an observable, testable fact. The silence is not the result of discipline. Then what happens?

P: Sir, let me ask you a question. In that state the registering of all noise goes on, the machine which registers, what is that thing?

Krishnamurti: The brain.

P: The brain is the material. So this registering goes on.

Krishnamurti: It goes on all the time, whether I am conscious or unconscious.

P: You may not name it but the sense of existence goes on.

Krishnamurti: No, you are using the word "existence" but recording goes on. I want to make the difference here.

P: Let us not move away. It is not that all existence is wiped out. It would be if thought ends.

Krishnamurti: On the contrary.

P: Existence; the sense of existence "is".

Krishnamurti: Life goes on but without the "me" as the observer. Life goes on, the registration goes on, memory goes on, but the "me" which thought has brought about, which is the content of consciousness, that "me" disappears; obviously because that "me" is the limited. Therefore thought as the "me" says "I am limited". It does not mean the body does not go on, but the centre, which is the activity as the self, as the "me", is not. Again that is logical because thought says I am limited. I will not create the "me" which is further limitation. It realizes it and it drops away.

P: Having said that thought creating the "me" is the limitation.....

Krishnamurti: Thought creating the "me" and the "me" realizing it is limited and therefore the "me" is not.

F: When this happens, why should I name what is going on as thought at all?

Krishnamurti: I am not naming anything. I realize that thought is the response of the past.

The "me" is made up of various additions of thought which have created the "me", which is the past. The "me" is the past. The

"me" projects the future.

Now the whole phenomenon is a very small affair. That is all.

Now what is the next question?

F: What has the state of this hopelessness to do with God?

Krishnamurti: It is not a state of hopelessness. On the contrary, you have introduced the quality of hopelessness because thought has said it cannot go beyond itself and therefore it is in despair.

Thought realizes that whatever movement it makes it is still within the field of time, whether it calls it despair, fulfilment, pleasure, fear.

F: So the realization of the limitations is a state of despair.

Krishnamurti: No, you are introducing despair. I am only saying despair is part of thought. Hope is part of thought and that thought says any movement I make, whether it is despair, pleasure, fear, attachment, detachment, is a movement of thought. When thought realizes all this is a movement of itself in different forms, it stops. Now let us proceed further.

P: I want to ask you a question. You said existence goes on without the "me". What or who proceeds further?

Krishnamurti: We have moved away from the word "God".

P: If my using the word "God" is very much within the field of thought, I have put it aside. Now I am moving with that. Therefore I am saying if thought as the "me" has ended, what is the instrument of investigation?

Krishnamurti: We have come to a point where there is no movement of thought. Investigating into itself so profoundly as we are doing now, so completely, so logically, thought has ended. It is now asking what is the new factor that comes into being which is

going to investigate or what is the new instrument of investigation. What is the instrument? It is not the old instrument. Right? The intellect, its sharpness of thought, the quality of thought, the objectivity, thought that has created tremendous confusion; all that has been denied.

P: Thought is word and meaning. If in consciousness, there is movement where there is no word and meaning, there is something else operating. What is this?

Krishnamurti: We have said thought is the past, thought is the word, thought is meaning, thought is the result of suffering. And thought says I have tried to investigate and my investigation has led me to see my own limitations. Now what is the next question? What is investigation then? If you see clearly the limitations, then what is happening?

P: Only the seeing.

Krishnamurti: No, seeing is visual and the sensory seeing depends on the word, the meaning.

P: After what we have said, there is only seeing which operates.

Krishnamurti: I want to be clear. The seeing with sensory perception, you say, is there. We have gone beyond that.

P: When you use the word seeing, is it a state where all the instruments are functioning?

Krishnamurti: Absolutely.

P: If there is one instrument functioning at a time, then it is tethered to thought. When there is seeing and no listening, it is tethered to thought. But when all the sensory instruments are functioning, then there is nothing to be tethered to. That is the only thing one can know. That is existence. Otherwise there would be

death.

Krishnamurti. We agree, then what is the next question? What is perception then? What is investigation there? What is there to investigate? What is there to explore? Right? What have you to say; you have all become silent?

P: When thought has come to an end there is nothing more to investigate.

Krishnamurti: When thought comes to an end, then what more is there to investigate? Then who is the investigator? And what is the result of investigation? Now which is it? What is there to investigate, or who is the instrument or what is the instrument that investigates?

P: One has always regarded investigation as moving towards a point.

Krishnamurti: Is it a forward movement?

P: We are trying to investigate God, truth, but as thought has ended, there is no point towards which there can be movement.

Krishnamurti: Go slow; do not say anything categorically. All that you can say is that there is no movement, no forward movement. Forward movement implies thought and time. That is all I am trying to get at. When you really deny that, you deny movement, outward or inward, then what takes place?

Now begins an investigation of a totally different kind.

First of all, the mind, the brain realizes it wants order, security, safety to function sanely, happily, easily. That is its basic demand. Now the brain realizes that any movement from itself is within the field of time and therefore, within the field of thought; then is there a movement at all? Or is there a totally different kind of

movement, qualitatively different, which is not related to time, to process, to the forward or backward movements?

Now we are asking, is there any other movement? Is there something which is not related to time?

Any movement as far as the brain is concerned, is within the field of time, outwardly or inwardly. I see that. The brain realizes that though it may think that it is extended infinitely, it is still very small.

Now, is there a movement which is not related to thought? This question is put by the brain, not by some super-entity. The brain realizes that any movement in time is sorrow. So it abstains from any movement, naturally. Then it is asking itself if there is any other movement which it really does not know, which it has never tasted?

That means one has to go back to the question of energy. There is human energy and cosmic energy. We have separated energy as human and cosmic. I have always been looking at human energy as separate, limited, incomplete within its limited field. Now the battle is over. Do you follow what I mean? Do you see it? I have always regarded the movement of energy as being within the limited field and separated it from cosmic, universal energy. Now thought has realized its limitation and therefore, human energy has become something entirely different. The division - the cosmic and the human - is created by thought. The division ceases and another factor has entered. To a mind which is not centred within itself, there is no division. Then what is there to investigate or what is the instrument of investigation? There is investigation but not the investigation to which I am used - the exercising of intellect, of



reason, and all the rest of it. And this investigation is not intuition. Now, the brain realizes that in itself there is no division. Therefore, the brain is not divided in itself as cosmic, human, sexual, scientific, business. Energy has no division.

Then what takes place? We started by asking if thought is materialistic? Thought is material, because brain is matter; thought is the result of the material; thought may be abstract but it is the result of the material. Obviously it is. Few have gone beyond.

F: The meaning of the body is consciousness; literally what is the meaning of existence?

Krishnamurti: What is the meaning of this room? Let us begin. Emptiness, because emptiness is created by the four walls and in that emptiness, I can put a chair and use the room.

F: The room has meaning because "P" lives there.

Krishnamurti: Furnishes, lives, fears, hopes, quarrels.

F: What is consciousness and you say the content, but I am asking more. What is the meaning, not the description?

D: The question of meaning is only for meaning.

Krishnamurti: "F" means something more. The meaning of my existence. None at all.....

F: Is there no question of your wanting to have meaning? What is the meaning of Krishnamurti? Can you negate the self? Then you are guillotined. The individual within, the censor, existence, consciousness, body; there is the more - the abstract soul; ultimately a soul around which everything impinges. Can you negate that?

Krishnamurti: The soul is the "me".

P: It is that which is the difficulty. There is a validity in "F"'s

question because the self is the most difficult thing to negate. If you attempt to negate the "ego" and the self you never will. But if you proceed as we have just done, that is all that is necessary.

F: What is the meaning of all this? Why should the "me" end? The meaning of the atoms is organism, the meaning of organism is consciousness. Why should it stop there?

Krishnamurti: It does not stop there. It stops there only when thought realizes its limitations. Let us come back. What is the instrument that is going to investigate, in which there is no separation, in which there is no investigator and the investigated? I see thought has really no meaning. It has meaning only within its small field. Now it asks what there is to discover - not as a discoverer discovering something.

What is the movement which is neither inward nor outward? Is it death? Is it the total negation of everything? Then what takes place? What is investigation?

When thought ends, we include everything in it; we include the meaning, consciousness, the content of consciousness, despair, failure, success. It is all within that field. When that ends, then what takes place? The brain exists, the recording - the part which is registering. The registering goes on. It must go on, otherwise, it would become insane, but there is the whole, which is totally quiet. Thought is no more involved. Thought does not enter into that field at all. Thought enters into a very small field of the brain.

P: It is a fact that we use only a millionth part of our brain.

Krishnamurti: There is the other part.

F: There is no reason to suppose that the remnants of the brain which are not used, can become anything more than other parts of

consciousness.

Krishnamurti: No, do look at it.

F: Even biologically, you are not correct. The size of the brain which is usable, determines the extent of consciousness. If you use more, consciousness will be greater.

Krishnamurti: The old brain is very limited. The entire brain is the new which has not been used. The entire quality of the brain is new; thought which is limited, functions in a limited field. The old brain is not active because the limited has ceased.

P: You know what you are saying? If you see a little part of the brain as limited, limitation ends.

Krishnamurti: No, limitation goes on.

P: But because it does not take over the whole part, nor limit itself to itself the rest of the brain, which is not used, becomes operable. Then this is again a totally materialist position.

Krishnamurti: Agreed. Carry on further.

P: That is all, there is nothing more to discuss.

F: I have an objection. Even if the entire brain is used fully, it will still only be consciousness; it will be a tremendously enlarged consciousness.

Krishnamurti: Depending if there is a centre.

D: If there is a centre, then you are not using the other.

F: We have been operating only within the limited. Now if you move into the other, how do you know that that consciousness has not a focalizing tendency?

Krishnamurti: Focalizing takes place when thought operates as pain, despair, success, when thought operates as the "me". When the "me" is silent, where is consciousness?

F: After that, it all becomes conjecture. You presume the only factor that can project the centre is disappointment, hurt. Thought is limited. And therefore, it projects itself. Why should focalization depend upon limitation?

Krishnamurti: Focalization takes place when thought is functioning.

P: If thought ceases with its meaning and word, if thought ceases, whatever becomes operable is not recognizable as word and meaning.

F: You are becoming very narrow. I am still legitimately questioning the point that frustration is the only point of focalization.

Krishnamurti: I included everything, not only frustration but everything in the field of time. Now I see that the brain cells have operated in a very small field and that small field with its limited energy has created all the mischief. The old brain becomes quiet. What we have called quietness is limitation becoming quiet. The noise of that has ended and that is the silence of limitation. When thought realizes that, then the brain itself, the whole brain, becomes quiet.

P: Yet it registers.

Krishnamurti: Of course. Noise is going on.

P: Existence continues.

Krishnamurti: Existence without any continuance. Then what? The whole brain becomes quiet, not the limited part.

F: It is the same thing to us.

P: If you do not know the other, and the other is not operable, what becomes quiet for us is only limitation.

Krishnamurti: Therefore, that quietness is not quietness.

P: This is something new which you are introducing.

D: What makes you say we are not using the whole brain?

F: I am saying my total brain is functioning but I am not conscious because I am enclosing myself within the limited field.

Krishnamurti: Please stop first the movement of thought, then see what happens.

D: When the movement of thought stops, things happen on their own and then is the enquiry of what happens necessary?

P: I want to ask one question here. You have said that the ending of the limitation of "me" as thought, is not silence.

Krishnamurti: That is the beauty of it.

P: Let me get the feeling of it. Please say it again.

Krishnamurti: I said when thought with its limitations says it is silent, it is not silent. Silence is when the total quality of the brain is still; the total thing, not just part of it.

F: Why should the total brain become silent?

Krishnamurti: The total brain has always been quiet. What I have called silence is the ending of the "me; the thought which is rattling around. The rattling around is thought. The chattering around has stopped completely. When the chattering comes to an end, then there is a feeling of silence but that is not silence. Silence is when the total mind, the brain, though registering, is completely quiet, because energy is quiet. It may explode but the basis of energy is quiet. (Pause)

Now, there is passion only when sorrow has no movement. Have you understood what I have said? Sorrow is energy. When there is sorrow there is the movement of escape by understanding

it, by suppressing it, but when there is no movement at all in sorrow there is an explosion into passion. Now the same thing takes place when there is no movement - outward or inward; when there is no movement of silence which the limited "me" has created for itself in order to achieve something more. When there is absolute silent, total silence, therefore no movement of any kind, when it is completely quiet, there is a totally different kind of explosion which is.....

P: Which is God. Krishnamurti: I refuse to use the word "God" but this state is not an invention. It is not a thing put together by cunning thought because thought is completely without movement. That is why it is important to explore thought and not the "other".

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 26 BOMBAY 11TH FEBRUARY 1971 'ENERGY, ENTROPY AND LIFE'**

Questioner D: The other day we discussed God. We also discussed energy and you spoke of human energy and cosmic energy. I will state the scientific position. Scientists have measured energy and have arrived at an equation:  $E=Mc^2$ , a fantastic figure. This is material energy and biologists have also proved that life-energy is anti-entropic, which means that while material energy dissipates itself, life energy does not. So this movement of anti-entropy is against the material flow of energy which dissipates and ends in dead uniformity. The human being generally moves with entropic energy and, therefore, decays. Scientists have measured even the time span of this energy. The problem is therefore: How can man, being aware of this, be part of the movement of energy that is anti-entropic?

Krishnamurti: One can see quite simply, that that which is mechanical wears itself out, given a certain time.

D: What is measurable can be manipulated by the mind, by man and that is the why of the atom bomb. This energy, this movement of entropy, dominates the world today. How do we get out of its grip?

P: This is a very important point. If there is a movement of energy which does not dissipate itself, which does not end, decay, then from the point of view of the scientist as well as man, it is probably the answer to all the problems of the world.

Krishnamurti: So what are you asking? How is man who is

caught in the movement of this mechanical decay - it may take a million years or ten million years - how can that decay be put to an end? Or is there a contrary movement?

D: And the nature of that contrary movement?

Krishnamurti: Let us put that question again simply. Man is caught in material energy, in mechanical energy; he is caught by technology, by the movement of thought - you get the key to it?

D: No.

Krishnamurti: There is the whole field of technological knowledge and the movement in that knowledge; that is the field in which man lives, which has tremendous influence on him, which is really taking him over, absorbing him; the scientists and the biologists have all measured the energy of that movement and that energy is an energy of decay, an energy of waste. Scientists also say

that there is a contrary movement of energy in the opposite direction which is creative energy; the real human energy which is non-mechanical, non-technological. Now, what is the question?

D: The modern biologists - Huxley, Chardin - say the species has developed up to man from the smallest cell and in man there is an emergence of consciousness; man as an entity can be conscious of the whole evolutionary process.

P: From this another very interesting fact emerges. Chardin says that the next leap forward will come by "a process of seeing" which is the same as the traditional pashyanti. I think it is important to explore this verb which has such a loaded traditional meaning in India.

Krishnamurti: We will come to that if we can examine the



decaying processes; the energy which is mechanical, which is entropic. We are also trying to find that life-energy, which is non-mechanical energy. What is this energy?

D: Biologists say it lies in cultural development, in the destiny of man, not in a new species emerging.

A: This question faces modern man at many levels. After the satellites went up, there was a new measurement of the cosmos. We call that the measurable infinite. But man also knows there is the immeasurable infinite. It comes to modern man the moment he gets out of the immediate and gets to an understanding of the environment in the widest sense.

Krishnamurti: Quite. They have measured thought. They have measured memory.

D: If you flow with material energy you are doomed. It is only inviting the entropic movement.

F: You said something - that they have measured thought. Do you think thought is measurable ?

Krishnamurti: Yes.

F: In what sense do you mean this?

Krishnamurti: In the sense that the electrical impulses of thought are measured.

F: Thought is the measure of entropy.

P: Only that which has a beginning and an end can be measured.

Krishnamurti: So there is a movement which ultimately, in its very motion, leads to decay.

F: It also leads to radiance and that is the end of entropy. There are those two movements - there is a mechanical movement and an anti-mechanical movement.

A: The biologist's approach is very tentative when he comes to consciousness. Whenever he speaks of life-energy, he does not speak with the same precision as the other. There is a recognition that the anti-entropic is the unknown, the un-definable. After having said that there is "the other", "the other" is still unknown.

D: One fact is certain. That the life-energy does not move in the direction in which the entropic energy moves.

A: Let us take the movement of life-energy as something unknown to us

We cannot manipulate it. In the measure that man becomes conscious of the entire evolutionary process in himself, he becomes aware of consciousness.

P: I think we are going round in circles. The observable thing is, man is born, lives and dies. The phenomenon of a cyclic movement of beginning and ending of energy is visible and deeply structured in our consciousness - the thing emerging and disappearing, the two manifestations of energy. Is there energy which is not concerned with emerging or disappearing?

Krishnamurti: It is the same thing. Do we accept this that there is a beginning and ending of energy?

F: Individuals may begin and end, but life does not. It creates.

Krishnamurti: Do not bring in the individual yet. There is a movement of energy which is mechanical, which is measurable, which may end, and there is life-energy which you cannot manipulate; it goes on infinitely. We see that in one case there is wastage of energy and in the other there is non-wastage of energy.

F: I do not see the other as a fact.

Krishnamurti: All right. Let us see the movement of energy

which can reach a height and decline. Is there any other form of energy which can never end, which is not related to the energy which begins, continues and withers away?

F: That is a legitimate question.

D: Is there any form of energy that will not decay?

Krishnamurti: Now how are we going to find out? I have got it.

What is energy that decays?

F: What is the cause of energy you cannot answer.

Krishnamurti: What is energy that decays? I did not say what is the cause of energy.

P: Material energy decays. Why does it decay? By friction?

D: By pressure?

Krishnamurti: Is there any other form of energy which does not decay? One decays through friction. Is there any other form which does not decay?

P: Not only does it decay but it is friction. I am positing it. Let us investigate. Its very nature is friction.

F: No. I do not understand your method. The fact is that there is energy overcoming friction, and energy dissipating in friction.

P: You say there is an energy which decays in friction through friction. I say its very nature is friction. All that movement which we call energy, in itself is friction. Show me why it is not so?

F: What is friction?

P: Friction is contradiction, resistance.

F: Why should energy be identified with resistance?

P: We say the nature of this which we call energy is friction. D: Energy is the capacity, biological capacity, to overcome resistance, but it dissipates itself in this process.

Krishnamurti: Like in a machine.

P: So it is manifest as friction.

Krishnamurti: So is there an energy which has no resistance at all, and therefore....

P: No. When you say that it does not touch resistance, it is not so. Life is full of resistance. How can you say this?

Krishnamurti: Let us go into this. Any energy that meets resistance wears itself out. A car going up the hill without enough power; the energy created by the machine will wear out. Is there an energy which can never wear out, whether you go uphill, downhill, parallel, vertical? Is there an energy which has no friction in itself? And if it meets resistance, it does not recognize resistance, it does not recognize friction.

There is another factor to it. Energy also comes into being through resistance, through manipulation.

P: The moment energy crystallizes.....

Krishnamurti: Do not say that.

P: Why, Sir, the human organism is a crystallization.

Krishnamurti: The human organism is a field of energy, but do not use the word crystallization.

I am keeping it very simple. There is energy that meets resistance and wears itself out. In that whole field, there is the energy brought about through resistance, through conflict, through violence, through growth and decay, through the process of time. Now we are asking, is there any other energy which is not of time, which does not belong to this field?

A: Tradition calls it the timeless arrow.

F: You are asking whether there is energy which is irresistible?

Krishnamurti: No. I only know energy which is in the field of time. It may have a span of ten million years, but it is still in the field of time. That is all we human beings know. And as human beings we are enquiring if there is an energy which is not in the field of time?

F: Do you mean, it is energy that does not undergo any transformation?

Krishnamurti: Look. I know energy, the cause of energy, the ending of energy. I know energy as the overcoming of resistance, I know the energy of sorrow, the energy of conflict, of hope, of despair; they are within the field of time. And that is the whole of my consciousness. I am asking, is there an energy which is not time-bound, which is not within the field of time at all? Is there energy which may go through the field of time and yet not be touched by time? It is very interesting. Man must have asked this question for centuries upon centuries, and not being able to find an answer he said there was God and put God outside the field of time. (Pause)

But putting God outside the field of time is to invite God into the field of time. And therefore all that is part of consciousness. And that decays. It decays, if I may use that word, because it is of time, it is divisible. And my mind which is divisible, wanting to find a timeless energy, proceeds to formulate an energy which it calls God and worships that. All that is within the field of time.

So I ask, is there any other energy which is not of time? You understand?

D: Yes.

Krishnamurti: How do I find out? I reject God, because God is

within the field of time. I reject the super-self, the atman, the brahman, the soul, heaven, for they are all within the field of time.

Now I ask, is there energy which is timeless? Yes, Sir. There is. Shall we go into it?

D: Yes, Sir.

Krishnamurti: How do I find out? Consciousness must empty itself of its content. Must it not?

D: The question is, I am sitting on a chair, which is my condition of existence. I cannot throw away the chair.

Krishnamurti: You cannot throw away the chair, but you can throw away the content which time has created which one calls consciousness.

D: The question is, if time is consciousness then there has to be something else.

Krishnamurti: Wait. The content makes consciousness; otherwise there is no consciousness.

P: May I ask something. Is the total emptying of consciousness not the same as seeing the totality of consciousness?

Krishnamurti: It is. Agreed. I do not think I have made myself clear. There is the fact of totally emptying consciousness; there is another fact which is seeing with the totality, with all the content.

Seeing the field of time as a total state, seeing the whole field of time - now what does that seeing mean?

Is that seeing different from the field of time or has that seeing separated itself from the field of time and then thinks it is free and looks at the field of time which is what we call perception?

D: Right, Sir. This perception presupposes a perceiver.

Krishnamurti: We go back to the same thing. So the question

arises what is total seeing? I see logically, verbally; I comprehend the whole consciousness of man, the whole of it. The whole of it is the content of it and the content of it has been accumulated through time, which is culture, religion, knowledge. Whether it expands or contracts, it is still within the field of time. When it expands, it includes God, not-God, nationalism or no-nationalism. It is the whole movement of consciousness within the field of time. It is time itself. What do you say "D", consciousness is time?

D: I have no other instrument but consciousness.

Krishnamurti: I am aware of that. I see consciousness is time because the content of it is consciousness and the content has been accumulated through centuries upon centuries. D: Consciousness is conflict, friction.

Krishnamurti: We know that. How can my mind look at this total field of time and not be of the field? That is the question. Otherwise, it cannot look. Total perception must be free of time. Is there a perception and seeing which is not of time? What do you say?

D: That is our question.

Krishnamurti: And if it is not of time, then perception is the life-movement. Perception itself is the life-movement.

D: Logically that would be so.

A: Can we say perception itself is the life-movement? I do not know anything about it.

Krishnamurti: Can my mind, which is of time, which is the content of consciousness - content is the accumulated impressions, the experience, the knowledge in time - can my mind being totally of time, disassociate itself from the total field? Or is there a

perception which is not of time and therefore sees the totality?

P: What I would say is I just cannot posit the "other". "A" is correct.

A: The moment I posit it, it becomes the God of the Upanishads. When you say it, I listen.

Krishnamurti: I have not yet said anything.

A: All I can say is that seeing that all consciousness is within the field of time, I can remain with it. I am "it".

Krishnamurti: You are "it". Somebody comes along and says that movement within the field of time is measurable and he asks is there a perception - he does not say there is or there is not - is there a perception which sees the totality of consciousness which is time?

Is there such a perception? That is a legitimate question.

P: May I say something? I see you. I see this room. I see the interiority of my consciousness. There is no more than that. I can see. It is a concrete thing. Seeing is concrete.

Krishnamurti: Are we wasting time?

P: We are not. We have to be concrete. This is seeing.

Krishnamurti: I understand "P", Here I am sitting in this room. I see the content of the room and myself in it. Myself is the observer who is conscious of the room, the proportion of room, the space of the room, and I see this through the consciousness which is made up of time.

P: I have taken a step back. Because I am seeing not only the length and breadth of the room, I see X as separate from Y; I am seeing. All this is the content of this room.

Krishnamurti: That is right. The observer and the observed are



within the field of time. That is all. When the observer invents something, that is still within the field of time. So any movement is within the field of time. That is all I know. That is a fact. But knowing that, somebody comes along and asks: Is there a movement which is not of time? And that is a legitimate question.

P: I do not know.

Krishnamurti: You can put it to yourself. Therefore, it is legitimate, because the very putting of it is legitimate. It may be a wrong question.

P: Putting it makes it a fact, not legitimate.

D: But it is a question. Question implies something more than a fact.

Krishnamurti: Which means, can the mind - I am proceeding from the question - see the totality of itself? Have you understood my question? Can the mind see itself as the field of time - not as an observer seeing the field of time? Can the mind itself become totally aware so that it sees consciousness as time? It is fairly simple.

P: I do not see that. What is involved in seeing consciousness as time? We started with this. There is a seeing of this room, the interiority of the self, the not dividing the two, the outer and the inner; that is the totality of time. There is no other totality.

A: Seeing the transitoriness is the seeing.

P: Where is the transitoriness? That is a loaded word. I just see.

D: If you just see then you do not see. The mind is part of time.

F: It is so clear. She only sees a section of me.

P: You are accepting too easily what Krishnaji is saying.

Krishnamurti: I only know one thing: I am the totality of

consciousness.

P: The totality of consciousness at this moment is the perceiving of the room and the interiority within me. That is all.

F: That is not all.

P: What else is there?

A: The other is seeing me not only as a person but as a vast process.

D: When you say "I see", is it a static movement you see or do you see movement as flux?

P: I see that. (Pointing) I see you talking the next minute. Where is flux in it?

A: Do you mean that the totality of what you perceive is in time?

P: I do not say that. I say where does time arise?

A: Is it seeing as static or as movement?

B: It will not do for us to conceptualize it.

P: When I am observing thought, I see it as flux. I see movement. I see thought as movement; I wake up to a thought having been, then again of thought having been, then again of thought having been. And I put these together and say there is movement. When Krishnaji says "perceive this room", I perceive the room, the interiority; there is no perception of time. It is the active present.

Krishnamurti: What is it that you are trying to say, "P"?

P: Your statement of the perception of consciousness as a movement of time is not valid. If we do not get the concreteness of seeing, we move into the field of the conceptual. Krishnamurti: What you are saying, are you not, is that you perceive when you

enter the room, the proportion, the space, the colour, and you perceive consciousness with the same tactile feel?

P: Then "A" speaks and I perceive that. Then I connect the two, and thought brings in time. There is no time apart from the connection.

Krishnamurti: If there is perception, there is no time. I look and there is no time.

P: You asked a question, "Do you see consciousness as the whole content of time?" I questioned that statement - I want to examine it with a microscope.

Krishnamurti: My mind is the result of time - memory, experience, knowledge. My consciousness is within the field of time. How can I see that the whole content is within the field of time?

P: Because of memory, of thought.

Krishnamurti: How can I see that the whole content is within the field of time? Is it a conclusion which we have arrived at just now or is it an actual perception? Let us go slowly. We have said verbally that my mind, the brain, the whole of it is the result of time. Is that a conclusion, or do I see it as a fact and not as a conclusion? Right, Sirs?

P: How would you distinguish the two?

Krishnamurti: One is a formula, a conclusion, a statement, the other I am finding out.

P: I find it very difficult. You know what you are trying to do, Sir? Can there be a perception of an abstraction? The moment thought is not, "what is" is an abstraction.

Krishnamurti: Wait. You have drawn your conclusions. I have

not come to any. When you say it is an abstraction, it is a conclusion.

P: I ask myself, when I say that consciousness is the product of time, is it a statement or is it something I can see?

Krishnamurti: Is it a statement with verbal meaning, which I accept, and therefore it becomes a conclusion, or is it an actual fact as this room, an actual fact that the whole of my brain, the whole of my consciousness is this enormous field of time? Is it as concrete as that?

P: How can it be as concrete as the other?

Krishnamurti: I will show it to you in a minute. I see a conclusion is not a fact, because thought has entered into it and heard this statement and accepts it and makes it a formula and remains with that formula. That is an abstraction. A formula is an abstraction created by thought and therefore it is the cause of conflict. It is the very nature of conflict. I see that very clearly. Now, is there a perception which is not of thought, of the total field of time as the mind? Formulas are the most deadly things. Formulas and concepts are products of thought and, therefore, are all within the field of time.

P: Why is it necessary to make this absolute statement at all? Why is it necessary to make an absolute, finite, statement?

Krishnamurti. I will show you in a minute. I am enquiring into the field of time. Time, we said, is consciousness. Time is the result of centuries upon centuries of experience. That is my consciousness, and the consciousness is made up of all the content. I hear you state that and thought picks it up and makes a formula of it. I see that the very formula is within the field of time, that very formula is the

factor of friction. So I do not touch it. I have negated it. I am now asking myself; have I negated it? Or am I still thinking, feeling that I have negated it? Am I still trying to find a fact which is not within the field of time? (Pause)

I am finding something - when thought operates, it must operate within the field of time, it must come to a conclusion and conclusion is part of consciousness; that is all. I now ask myself, is there any movement of thought or am I pretending to myself that there is no movement of thought and only perception? When I come to this room, I see. There is no movement of thought. I just see. The moment thought comes in, it comes into the field of time. Now I am asking, is the mind deceiving itself by saying "I have no formula", but is entrenched in formula; formula being thought, which is consciousness? Or is there a perception which has nothing whatsoever to do with thought? I only know that all consciousness is within the field of time and thought is consciousness.

Therefore, I am enquiring - I do not want to deceive myself, I do not want to pretend that I have got something which I have not got. I see whenever thought comes into being, it must create a formula, and the formula is within the field of time. The whole of consciousness is time. I hear you say this. Now is it a formula which I have accepted or is it a fact - the fact being there is a perception of the total movement of thought?

P: You see, Sir, these are words which you use - the total movement of thought - what is meant by those words? When you ask whether we have accepted it as a formula, I have neither accepted it as a formula nor is it a fact. It is neither of these.

Krishnamurti: But by listening, by examining, by investigating,

you say this is so. It is not a question of accepting. Now, move a step further. Is that "it is so", an acceptance of an idea, intellectual and therefore still within the field of time?

P: I will never answer that question to you or to myself.

Krishnamurti: I am asking it.

P: What do I answer?

Krishnamurti: You are not asking that question. You know nothing about it. I want to find out whether the mind that is the result of time, hearing that statement, does it accept it as a statement, as a formula, and therefore remains in time, or it sees the truth, it sees the fact. Then what takes place? It is a fact. Nothing more can be said when thought does not arise. I see the room, but the moment thought says it has proportion, colour, beauty, time enters - you follow? In the same way this whole field of time exists only when thought operates. Now am I pretending that this operation is a formula or is it a fact which is realizable, which we can be aware of? Or is thought completely absent, and only aware of time and nothing more? Then what takes place? I am aware of this room without any interference of time.

P: At this moment, this instant what are you aware of?

Krishnamurti: The mind which is the result of time, hearing what you are saying, that the whole of consciousness is time, accepts that as a formula and says, "yes". the statement "yes" is the perception of a conclusion which is the operation of thought. Therefore, I see that there is still time operating in that sense.

So is there an operation of perception without thought? What takes place then?

P: What are you perceiving at this moment? (Pause)

Krishnamurti: (Makes a gesture brushing one hand over the other) Nothing. That is it. It is logically right.

A: When we come, when we hear, the next moment it has become a memory.

Krishnamurti: I am not concerned about you at all. Forgive me. I am not concerned whether you see or do not see. I said to you I am going to investigate. I am investigating. You are not investigating. You are merely remaining with the formula. I see this fact. Am I perceiving the formula with a formula, or perceiving without a movement of thought without a formula? Then "P" asks me, in that state what is there to perceive? Absolutely nothing, because it is not of time. That is the factor of life-energy.

F: The state which you are just now describing can be called entropy of thought, a state where no movement is possible any more.

Krishnamurti: You are not investigating.

F: It has not ended here. You are ending it.

P: I want to ask another question. You say that there is nothing. Is there movement?

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by movement, before I say yes or no?

P: From here to there.

Krishnamurti: Measurable, comparable. Measurable means movement. The movement, when it is measured, is within the field of time. Right? And you are asking me whether in that nothingness, there is movement? To you movement is measurable and if I say there is, you will then tell me it is measurable and

therefore it is in time.

P: There is movement in nothingness.

Krishnamurti: Which means what? The movement of time is one thing and the movement of nothingness is not of time, therefore not measurable. But it has its own movement which you cannot possibly understand unless you leave the movement of time. And that is infinite and that movement is infinite.



**TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 27**  
**BOMBAY 15TH FEBRUARY 1971**  
**'INTELLIGENCE AND THE INSTRUMENT'**

Questioner P: I wanted to ask you Krishnaji, if there is one question which needs to be asked by the individual, which would open the door to reality. Can all questions be reduced to the one question?

F: Is there such a thing as a door? We cannot ask a question about that, for which there can be no metaphor.

Krishnamurti: I think she asks, in the sense of a door, an opening, a breakthrough.

F: From your own experience what would you say is breaking-through? There is no point of reference.

Krishnamurti: What is the question?

P: There are many things which we have discussed during the last few days. Can all these questions converge into one question?

Krishnamurti: I think so.

F: I would not put it that way. I come to you because in you there is an imponderable quality, a tiny seed of something which makes you entirely different. I do not look for differences in manifestation, but there is in you a tiny little touch of something, that "elseness" of yours - now is there a key to that? Is there a question which opens that up?

B: If I may ask, what is it that prevents one from seeing? The difficulty is with us. Last evening when we heard Krishnaji's talk we felt that there was nothing which we would not be prepared to do, if it was in us to do it. Can all that you say be held in one

question? To you it is a very simple thing. You have an amazing capacity of converting diversity into a single thing. This convergence has not taken place in us. Could there be some action which would make all questions melt into one question?

P: I would further ask, if it were not possible to simplify all questions into one question, is there an instrument and what is that instrument which will make this possible? There is one interesting fact that I have observed in what Krishnaji has been saying in the last few days, and that is, he does not say thought is totally unnecessary. He says thought has a place and thought has no place. There is a region where thought is necessary and there is a region where thought has no function. The mechanism which makes it possible for thought to operate only where it should and not where it should not, without any evaluation, without the operation of will, without a doer, without a director, without a trick; that instrument, that mechanism is the essential thing.

How does it happen that thought arises only where it legitimately should function and does not impinge into areas where it should not function, because there thought has investment in illusion?

Krishnamurti: Now what is the question?

P: What is the instrument? How does this happen? We have examined our minds with a microscope. Now we ask under whose command do the brain cells function? What happens to them if there is no one to direct, to command?

Krishnamurti: I thought "K" explained yesterday that it is intelligence.

D: It is the same thing. Intelligence means instrument.

Krishnamurti: Let us keep to the word "intelligence".

D: How does it happen? Intelligence functions in different dimensions. The artist, the philosopher use intelligence, but that is not intelligence.

Krishnamurti: Intelligence is that quality of mind which can use knowledge, all the vast field of knowledge, but not use knowledge in another field.

F: The difference that exists between me and you, is it in the degree of intelligence or is there another factor operating in you?

Krishnamurti: "P" asked a question, which is, what is the essential demand in life? And she goes on further to ask whether thought can operate sanely, efficiently in the whole field of knowledge where it is necessary and not operate in another field where it brings chaos, misery? Now what is the thing that can prevent thought from operating so that it does not create misery?

Can we tackle this question differently? Can the mind, the totality of the mind, empty itself of everything, of knowledge and non-knowledge; the knowledge of science and language and also the mechanism of thought that functions all the time? Can the mind empty itself of all that? I do not know if I am making myself clear. Can the mind empty itself not only at the conscious level but at the deeper secret chambers of the mind? From that emptiness can knowledge operate and not operate?

B: The question then would be emptiness?

Krishnamurti: Let us see. Can the mind empty the whole content of itself as the past, so that it has no motive? Can it empty itself and can that emptiness use knowledge, pick it up, use it and drop it, but always remain empty?

Emptiness in the sense of the mind being nothing; emptiness which has its own movement, which is not measurable in terms of time. A movement which is in emptiness, which is not the movement of time, that movement can operate in the field of knowledge and there is no other operation. That movement can only operate in the field of knowledge and nowhere else.

P: Are they two movements?

Krishnamurti: That is why I said that movement can operate only in knowledge; it has no two movements. Please follow. I am just investigating. You are asking a question, which is, that from what you have observed in your talks here, "K" has divided knowledge and freedom from knowledge.

Knowledge operating in the field of science in which there must be a certain will, a certain direction, an operative function, a design; and knowledge not operating where there is no place for thought and therefore of will.

B: You mean not even thought which is more than will?

Krishnamurti: Of course. Let us get the question clear. I am a little bit doubtful of the question.

F: It seems sometimes we operate deliberately and sometimes non-deliberately. I can see I do something of which I know nothing, and yet I operate. So there are these two operations: mental and non-mental. The movement of the two are not separate.

Krishnamurti: Watch your own mind, "F". You see thought operating always within the field of knowledge. The knowledge brings pain and that knowledge helps man to live more comfortably environmentally. Right? - and that thought also brings misery, confusion. That is a fact.

F: I object to the "always".

Krishnamurti: Wait. Then you and I ask, is thought necessary? Why does it create misery? Is it possible for thought not to create misery? That is all. Keep it as simple as this.

F: My answer to that is the roots of misery are not known to me. The promptings which create misery, I do not know.

Krishnamurti: We began with the superficial layers. Now we will go into the secret chambers of the mind.

P: Surely we are not positing a state of consciousness where thought will operate at the technological level and at the day-to-day level of action where necessary, and if by some kind of trick, electric shock, all other consciousness as thought were to be wiped away, it would be enough? We are not postulating that surely.

Krishnamurti: Of course not.

P: But look Sir, the moment you speak of a place where thought can operate legitimately and a place where thought has no legitimate place you are postulating the other - a state which is non-thought. If consciousness is only content, then what is the other?

D: I can go into a state of constant euphoria. Is that enough? This can happen through lobotomy.

Krishnamurti: Then you become a vegetable.

D: Then if that is not so, what else is there in consciousness?

F: When you said that thought is consciousness, it is there that I put a question mark? Is thought the entirety of consciousness? Can we say that consciousness is nothing beyond thought? I would question this.

Krishnamurti: So we have to go into the question of consciousness.

B: We are going back. You used the word "intelligence" in a different way. That word is the key, if we know what it is. P: But this also a very valid question-if content is thought, if all consciousness is content and it is legitimate for thought to function in the field of technology, and all impinging of thought in the psychological direction is pain, then cutting thought away, will it solve the problem?

Krishnamurti: No.

P: Then what is the "other"?

F: Intelligence is different from consciousness. We must distinguish between the two. Intelligence is much vaster than consciousness. We can have unconscious intelligence.

P: What is consciousness?

Krishnamurti: What is consciousness? There is a waking consciousness, there is hidden consciousness; consciousness of certain parts of me, of the superficial mind, and a lack of total awareness of the deeper layers of consciousness.

P: I would say, Krishnaji, that there is a consciousness in which thought operates, then there is a consciousness where attention is and where there is seeing; and a consciousness which is unconscious of thought. I see these three states as they operate in me.

Krishnamurti: Three states which are the memory, -

P: Being awake when thought is not, -

Krishnamurti: Wait, wait. The memory, the operation of memory as thought, as action; then attention, a state of attention where there is no thinker.

P: And a state of being asleep when you are not aware of

thought nor of attention.

Krishnamurti: So you are saying there is the operation of thought, memory, having been and will be. Then there is a state of attention and there is a state in which there is neither attention nor thought, but a sense of being half asleep.

P: Half awake, half asleep.

Krishnamurti: All this is what you would call consciousness. Right?

P: In all these states whether consciously or unconsciously, sensory perceptions are in operation.

F: Do not bring in the unconscious. Do not call the unconscious a form of consciousness.

D: I wanted to ask whether we cannot include dreams also into it; that is the unconscious part.

F: Dreams are dreams because they become conscious.

P: The state in which one spends a large part of the day, one goes out, images come and go; that is still consciousness.

F: This is a patchy thing. The point is consciousness is not a continuous phenomenon.

Krishnamurti: Can we start this way? I am just being tentative - there is consciousness, wide or narrow, deep or shallow. As long as there is a centre which is conscious of itself, that centre may expand or contract. That centre says I am aware or not aware. That centre can attempt to go beyond the limitations which it has placed around itself. That centre has its deep roots in the cave and superficially operates. All that is consciousness. In all that there must be a centre.

P: May I ask you a question? Let us be very careful. Would you

say there is no operation of consciousness in you?

Krishnamurti: We will come to that presently. That is not the point.

A: I wanted to ask whether there is such a thing as the matrix in which there is not even a centre, because it is out of that the centre is formed?

Krishnamurti: Matrix?

A: Matrix is thought; the matrix of temporality.

P: Consciousness is that which registers. It is the only thing which distinguishes life from a state of death. As long as there is registering there is no death.

Krishnamurti: Are we speculating? Look, let us begin very simply. When are you actually conscious?

P: When I am awake, when I am aware.

Krishnamurti: I would begin very simply. When am I conscious?

P: I am conscious of this discussion.

Krishnamurti: Let us keep it simple. When am I conscious? Either through sensory reaction, through a sensory shock, a sensory resistance, a sensory danger, a conflict in which there is pain-pleasure. It is only in those moments that I say I am conscious. I am aware of that lamp, the design; I perceive that there is a reaction and I say it is ugly or beautiful. Is not that the basis of all this? I do not want to speculate. I ask myself "when am I conscious?" When I am challenged, when there is an impact, conflict, pain, pleasure, then I am conscious.

D: But there may be no focus at all.

Krishnamurti: Wait Sir. I want to start here; otherwise we get



lost in theory. This whole phenomenon is going on, whether there is a deliberate awareness or not, this thing is operating all the time. That is what we call consciousness.

F: The response to impact.

P: You mean there is no photographic consciousness. I see a dust-bin....

Krishnamurti: But you are seeing it. The mind is registering it. That is, the brain cells are receiving all these impacts.

F: And in that is there no classification as pain, pleasure?

Krishnamurti: Impact as pleasure, pain, conflict, sorrow, conscious, or unconscious, is going on all the time and there may be an awareness of all that at one moment, and at other moments there may not be. But it is going on all the time. So what is the next question?

P: This process itself is consciousness and the centre that observes is also part of consciousness.

Krishnamurti: What is the next question?

B: What is the nature of the unconscious?

Krishnamurti: It is still the same. Only it is the deeper layer.

B: Why are we unconscious of the deeper layer?

Krishnamurti: Because superficially we are very active all the time. B: So the density of the superficial layer prevents our being conscious of the deeper layers.

Krishnamurti: I am making noises on the surface. It is like swimming on the surface. So what is my next question?

B: Is it possible to integrate the various layers?

Krishnamurti: No.

P: What is the relationship of thought to consciousness?

Krishnamurti: I do not understand this question because thought is consciousness.

P: Is there anything else but thought?

Krishnamurti: Why do you put that question?

P: Because we started with the question that I observed you speak of a region where thought has a legitimate place and a region where thought has no legitimate place - and yet you say thought is consciousness.

Krishnamurti: Slowly. Let us stop here. The first question was, is thought part of this whole thing? What is its relationship to consciousness? Consciousness is thought - pain, conflict, registration, memory, remembrance. When the superficial consciousness is making a lot of noise, you come and ask what is the relationship between thought and all that? Thought is all that.

P: You have said something just now - thought is part of all that. Then what is the rest?

A. All this is consciousness. Thought comes into operation when the "I" wants to localize.

Krishnamurti: That is right.

F: When the brain is cut off then there is no thought.

Krishnamurti: Which is the memory squeezed, held and paralysed. All that we have described, memory, everything, is consciousness. Now thought comes into operation when I am interested in a part of this. The scientist is interested in the material phenomena, the psychologist in his area, because he has limited the field of investigation. Then thought comes as a systematizer.

F. Is thought the non-self-consciousness?

Krishnamurti: When "P" asks what is the relationship between

thought and consciousness, I think that is a wrong question.

P: Why?

Krishnamurti: There is no relationship between the two because there are no two. Thought is not something separate from all this.

P: Is thought part of it or is thought all?

Krishnamurti. Go slow. I do not want to say something which is untrue.

F: Thought is co-extensive with consciousness. Let us not subdivide.

Krishnamurti: "P" asks "F", a very simple question. What is the relationship between thought and all this?

F: Which is the "other". She has no business to speak of the two as separate.

P: I won't accept this so easily because in everything "K" says the "other is posited. Thought has a legitimate place in the field of technology and it has no legitimate place in the other field and if you were to perform an operation and wipe out thought, it is not enough. Therefore the "other" is posited.

A: What I am trying to say is, is there in consciousness space which is not covered by thought?

P: Quite right.

Krishnamurti: I am not at all sure. I do not say you are not right. So go on.

A: I say there is space in consciousness which is not thought and that is part of the human heritage. It is there.

Krishnamurti: I do not think in consciousness there is any space.

P: I want to put another question to you. When I perceive you and listen to the whole thing operating, there is no movement of

thought, but I am totally conscious. I cannot say -

Krishnamurti: Why do you call that consciousness? Wait, go slow. "A" says there is space in consciousness. We have to answer that question.

P: Whenever you make a statement like that, you immediately come to this that wherever there is space there is a boundary.

A: I may be using the wrong word.

Krishnamurti: You have used the right word. But we do not see that space cannot be contained in a frontier, in a boundary, in a circle.

A: It is not space, if it is held within a circle, a square, a rectangle. In one sense, of course, it is space.

Krishnamurti: Where there is a border there is no space.

D: According to the scientists, time and space are bound together.

Krishnamurti: But when we say consciousness has space, then consciousness has time. Do not call that space. Space exists only when there is time. Time is limitation. Space in the sense in which we use the word does not exist in consciousness. That space is something else. Leave that for the moment. Now what is the next question?

P: If we can take it from this point, I ask what is the relationship of thought to consciousness. Is thought contained in consciousness?

Krishnamurti: Do not use the word relationship. That means the two; thought means all that. Thought is consciousness. Do not put it in any other way.

P: Yes. Thought is consciousness, listening is consciousness,

learning is consciousness. If thought is consciousness, is thought not related to seeing as consciousness?

Krishnamurti: Put the question this way. Is there a state of mind when there is no learning at all? You see the question?

P: You have left us far behind now.

F: There are fields in which we operate without consciousness. Most of our relationships are beyond the reach of consciousness. I operate unconsciously.

Krishnamurti: I want to go slowly, please. Thought is consciousness, listening is consciousness and learning is consciousness. Listening, seeing, learning, hearing, is part of all this, and memorizing and reacting to that memory is part of all this.

P: When any one of these is operating, there is no other. What you then say is understandable. Then there is no duality. Now we take the next step. When each of these operates, it is consciousness.

Krishnamurti: And it is not a dualistic consciousness.

P: Is it the part operating?

Krishnamurti: I would not use the word part. It is the focalizing of consciousness. It is not the whole of consciousness. Look, I say a few words in French or Italian; at that moment there is just that.

P: What about the English?

Krishnamurti: It is still there.

When thought is operating in that specific field, there is no duality. When thought compares that particular operation to another then there is duality. Right? I say how marvellous that lamp is. It is finished. But when thought says I wish I had it in my room, then there is duality. See what has been found, when there is the simple functioning of thought without any motive, there is no

duality.

P: This again is very difficult - thought is motive.

Krishnamurti: No. What is thought? I have a memory of that sunset - I see that sunset. It is recorded at that moment, it is finished. But thought comes along and says....

P: I am saying thought is motive, not the registration, because thought is word, word is loaded, word is meaning.

Krishnamurti: There is memory of that sunset, then thought says, I wish it would happen again. In that, motive operates.

D: Yes Sir. When you look at that sunset, motive is irrelevant.

P: Sunset is an impersonal thing, let us not take that. I am jealous. There is a movement of jealousy as thought. You see Krishnaji, this is in some subtle way connected with the problem of containing - space - time -

Krishnamurti: "P", you just now said jealousy. Jealousy is the factor of duality - that is, my wife looks at another man, and I feel jealous because I possess her, she is mine. But if I observe, if I am aware that she is not mine from the beginning, then the factor of jealousy does not enter. She is a free human being as I am a free human being. I allow her freedom.

P: I understand that. But we are talking about the structure of thought. Thought arises in consciousness. In itself there is no duality.

Krishnamurti: There is duality only when there is the operation of motive, measurement, comparison. In the observation of a lovely sunset, in seeing the light, the shadow, there is no duality. The word "beautiful" may be dualistic in terms of the ugly, but I am using the word without comparison. The moment I say I wish I

had it again, begins the dualistic process. That is all.

P: We have somehow moved away.

Krishnamurti: I will come back, which is, consciousness is perception, hearing, seeing, listening, learning and the memory of all that and the responding according to that memory. All that is consciousness, whether or not focalized. In that consciousness is time; time which creates space because it is enclosed. Let us stop there. In that there is duality, non-duality, the conflicts - I must, I must not - the whole of that field is consciousness. All that is consciousness. And in that there is no space at all because it has boundaries, frontiers, which are limitations.

A: There is another factor which I would like to have included. There are the perceptions of various peoples of the world - of the African Continent, of the Latin American Continent; there is some kind of movement constantly going on; there are the findings of the physicists, the biologists - the perceptions and experiences of the world are syphoning into my consciousness. How can we ignore all that? If we only take the "I" and see the source of it, it is not enough: What is this process by which that thing is syphoning into me? The movement of the "I" as thought is something that is constantly being fed and renewed by that. Unless I see this process, I do not understand.

Krishnamurti: We said, Sir, the whole of this field of consciousness is the movement of contraction and expansion, a movement of information, knowledge, registration of knowledge, motivation, change, the political theme, what is going on in the Middle East, all that is happening in the environment, is part of me: I am the environment and the environment is the me. In that whole

field there is the movement of the me. I like the Arabs and I do not like the Jews - within this consciousness, this comes up -

A: I question that. I say when I see all that, I am not even taking sides because there are the African tribes liberated and then caught up in militarism and all that.

Krishnamurti: See what happens. Colonialism, freedom from colonialism, the tribe, then the identification with the tribe as the me who belongs to the tribe.

A: In this wide canvas we see thought is syphoning into this focus which we call consciousness.

Krishnamurti: All that is consciousness. Consciousness creates the mischief by saying, "I like", "I do not like". I see that, I am a witness to this "I like" and "I do not like" also, because that is part of this movement over which I have no control at all.

A: I would say that may be so. But that is not the problem. The problem is the identification which gives this weightage to the "I like" and "I don't like", that it builds around it.

Krishnamurti: Here I am born in India, with all the environment, all the superstitions, the riches and poverty, the sky, the hills, the economic, the social, the whole of that is me.

A: Something more.

Krishnamurti: Include the more.

A: The more is the entire historical and the pre-historical past. If you include all that, then choice disappears.

Krishnamurti: Wait, Sir, I am all that, the past and the present and the projected future; I am born in India with all the culture of 5000 years. That is all my point. That is what I call consciousness.

A: It is wider; it includes America, the whole world -



Krishnamurti: But choice arises when you say you are a Hindu and I am a Muslim; when there is focalization through identification, there is then choice.

P: Let us come back to what we were saying. All this is consciousness and the other is also a fact that when thought operates, thought is consciousness, listening, seeing is consciousness, and I ask the question "what is the relation between thought and consciousness?"

Krishnamurti: It is a wrong question.

P: All right. We say consciousness is thought, seeing is consciousness, listening is consciousness, thought is consciousness.

Krishnamurti: All the heritage which "A" brought in is also consciousness, past, ancient, present and all that.

P: You have been stating that it is legitimate for thought to operate in fields where knowledge is necessary and when it operates in other fields then it brings sorrow, pain, duality. The question is: Does the other state which you are talking about, is it also consciousness?

Krishnamurti: Let us examine that. Stick to that question. What do you say? P: I say it is consciousness because seeing is consciousness.

Krishnamurti: Seeing that light is consciousness.

P: That is the first question.

Krishnamurti: Stick to that question for the moment. Thought has a legitimate field of operation and if it impinges into other fields then it brings pain, suffering. That which operates in this area, is it still consciousness - consciousness as we know it with all

the things we have put into it? The other is not.

P: The other is not what?

Krishnamurti: It is not thought.

P: But is it consciousness? I will open it out a little more. The sensory perceptions operate. Seeing, listening operates, therefore why do you say it is not consciousness?

Krishnamurti: I am saying consciousness in the sense that there is no conflict.

P: There is no conflict in consciousness. There is only conflict when consciousness operates as thought in the field where it has no legitimate place. Why should there be conflict in consciousness when thought is not operating?

Krishnamurti: There is no conflict at all there. Let us go slowly.

P: Then what is it that operates there?

Krishnamurti: Is intelligence consciousness? Intelligence is not consciousness.

P: Now we are just listening. Now we come to a stage where we just listen.

Krishnamurti: My mind has followed all this. It has seen as "A" pointed out, the whole content of consciousness as the past Indian tradition, the whole human heritage and that I am all that. Consciousness is all that. Heritage is consciousness. And that consciousness as we know it, is conflict. And my chief concern is to end that conflict, conflict being sorrow, pain. In examining that, there is a discovery that it is all a process of thought. There is pain and pleasure and from that the mind says it must operate in the field of knowledge and not here. Legitimately it operates in one, but not here. What has happened to my mind? It has become

pliable, soft, alive. It sees, it hears. It does not have the quality of conflict in it, and that is intelligence. And that is not consciousness.

Intelligence is not heritage whereas consciousness is heritage.

Do not translate intelligence as God.

Now that intelligence can use knowledge, that intelligence can use thought to operate in the field of knowledge and therefore its operation is never dualistic.

D: The language of intelligence must be different from the language of thought.

Krishnamurti: Intelligence has no language, but it can use language. The moment it has language it is back again in the field. That intelligence having no language is not personal. It is not mine or yours.

P: It may not be personal but is it focalized?

Krishnamurti: No, it appears to focalize.

P: When it moves, does it focalize?

Krishnamurti: Of course, it must, but it is never in focalization.

P: It is never held?

Krishnamurti: It is like holding the sea in the fist: it is part of the sea, but it is not the sea.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 28 BOMBAY 16TH FEBRUARY 1971 'RIGHT COMMUNICATION'**

Questioner A: Sir, we have been listening to you with all the attention of which we are capable, with our minds and with all our analytical capacities. We have covered every inch of the ground and we no longer accept anything we do not understand. Between you and us there has been verbal communication and there has been communication beyond words. By ourselves we have not been able to penetrate the verbal barrier and reach that understanding which comes beyond words. When I sit by myself, I find that all communication with myself remains at the verbal level. I wonder whether we could take up for discussion the problem of communication.

Tradition has classified communication into four different states vaikhari, madhyama, pashyanti and

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 29 BOMBAY 18TH FEBRUARY 1971 'BIOLOGICAL SURVIVAL AND INTELLIGENCE'**

Questioner P: There was something which Krishnaji said in his talk yesterday. I do not know whether it will bear discussion. It was a very startling statement. The question he posed was whether the brain cells could strip themselves of everything except the movement of survival, the pure biological necessity which alone makes the organism exist? Krishnaji seemed to suggest that before any movement in the new dimension could take place, this total stripping to the bare bedrock was essential. In a sense he was totally back to the materialistic position.

D: If you have survival as the dimension of existence, there is no other dimension. Can this bear investigation? Is such stripping of every element of consciousness as we have understood it, possible? We have always claimed that the human being is more than the urge for survival.

F: Are the brain cells not the repository of culture?

P: If you strip man of every psychological element except the urge for physical survival, how is he different from the animal?

Krishnamurti: We know both biological and psychological survival. The biological exists on survival, but psychological factors have made that survival almost impossible.

F: You are now bringing in other elements.

Krishnamurti: There are these two elements - the biological and the psychological. Psychological elements like nationalism are preventing man from surviving. Psychological fragmentation is

destroying the beauty of survival. Can one strip man of all the psychological factors?

P: Apart from the biological and psychological, is there anything else? You spoke of stripping yourself of all factors, not psychological. I am asking you is there any other element excepting the biological and the psychological?

Krishnamurti: As far as we know these are the only two factors that operate in man.

F: Is there not such a factor as psychological survival, apart from the physiological?

Krishnamurti: Which means the survival of the psyche. The psyche that is the result of environment, of heritage. Last evening when we used the word "consciousness", we said the whole of consciousness is the content of consciousness. The content of consciousness is conflict, pain; the whole of that is consciousness.

D: You said also that intelligence is more than consciousness.

Krishnamurti: Wait. We said in understanding the fact of consciousness and going beyond it, is intelligence. You cannot come to that intelligence if this consciousness is in conflict. Now all that we know is biological survival and the survival of psychological consciousness. What is the next question?

P: You said or implied yesterday that there was a necessity to strip so that nothing existed but biological survival.

Krishnamurti: Can you not strip the whole content of consciousness which is psychological? In stripping, that intelligence is in operation. There is the biological and intelligence - there is no other.

P: You did not speak of intelligence yesterday. You said when

there is this total stripping and no other thing, that operation is the biological movement of survival and that perceives. Is there such a seeing?

Krishnamurti: Then the mind is not merely the survival element, but there is another quality in it which perceives.

P: What is that quality?

Krishnamurti: What did "K" say yesterday?

P: He said there is a stripping and there is only the movement of survival and that silence sees

Krishnamurti: Perfectly true. Now what is silence? What is the nature of silence?

P: That seeing is something which we can affirm. But there was this other thing said, so that we cannot help asking if man is stripped of everything which we consider the elements of the human.....

Krishnamurti: Which is conflict, pain.

P: Not only that, compassion -

B: We consider that man is human as opposed to the animal. What are the things which differentiate man - intelligence, the capacity to analyse, speech -

D: Man is a language animal. Language and man are co-related. And that is the mark of man that distinguishes him from the rest of the animal world. What language does to man is to enable him to say "I am I". And the moment he goes beyond it, he speculates, projects; he says "I am I" and in that "I" you can bring in the whole cosmology. There is no language for the other.

B: And one more thing. Because of language, man has been able to evolve culture and he cannot go back to the biological

stage.

D: In twenty-five thousand years of evolution, of thinking, of speaking and so on, there is very little change in man; the environment has changed, but fundamentally there is very little change in man.

Krishnamurti: Yes.

P: One says right, or I accept what "B" or "D" says, but still I am aware "I am". That statement is where it is. Krishnamurti: "B" is saying very simply: strip man of all the psychological factors and what is the difference between animal and man? Oh, there is a vast difference.

P: The moment you posit a difference, then you are investigating something else.

B: Man is aware of himself and the animal is not; that is the only distinction.

Krishnamurti: Let us go back. There is psychological survival. We want to survive psychologically and also biologically.

D: I say there is something else.

Krishnamurti: We will have to find out. Merely to posit that there is something else has no meaning.

D: But you say all other aspects of the human being have ended.

Krishnamurti: When conflict, misery, pain have ended.....

P: As also the fantasy, the wonder, imagination; that which has made man reach out, reach in.

Krishnamurti: "K" said both the outer and the inner.

P: It is the same movement. When you say all this is to be stripped, what happens? Is that legitimate to ask? Can we, in discussion, can we in going through this, get the feeling of that



stripping, that seeing?

Krishnamurti: We have said intelligence is beyond consciousness and when the mind is stripped of the psychological elements, in the very stripping there is the uncovering of this intelligence. Or intelligence comes into being in the very stripping. There is the biological survival and intelligence. That is all.

Intelligence has no heritage. Consciousness has heritage. We are caught in the becoming within the field of consciousness. Within the field of consciousness we are trying to become. Strip all that. Empty all that. Let the mind empty itself of all that. In the very emptying comes intelligence.

Therefore there are only two things left: the highest form of intelligence and survival which is entirely different from animal survival. Man is not merely the animal because he is able to think, design, construct.

P: Do you mean to say there is intelligence which manifests itself in stripping?

Krishnamurti: Listen carefully. My consciousness is all the time trying to become, change, modify, struggle, etc. That is all I know. Biological survival and that. Everybody operates within these two. And within that struggle we project something beyond consciousness which is still within consciousness because it is projected.

The mind that really wants to be free from the wrangle, the back-chattering asks, can the mind strip "itself" of all the content of "itself"? That is all. (Pause.) And in that, intelligence comes to be.

P: Is stripping, emptying an endless process?

Krishnamurti: Certainly not. Because then I am caught in the

same phenomenon.

P: Let us pause here. Is it not an endless process?

Krishnamurti: It is not an endless process. P: You mean, once it is done, it is done?

Krishnamurti: Let us go slowly. You must first understand this verbally. My consciousness is made up of all that we have talked about.

P: Is the emptying of it, does it take time or is it free of time? Is it piecemeal? Or is it an emptying of the whole?

Krishnamurti: Is that the question? The piecemeal and the whole? Is that the question?

P: You see, putting the question as the piecemeal and the whole is the query. What is revealed is the whole which contains the piece.

B: Stripping has to be a joint process.

Krishnamurti: Discuss it.

P: What is it that one strips? Or what is it that one perceives? Or is there dissolution of that which emerges? There cannot be dissolution of anything else. What emerges is thought.

D: If all these go what remains?

P: When you say all goes, what does it mean?

B: Only awareness remains. Is complete awareness the whole?

P: Yes.

Krishnamurti: She says Yes. What is the question?

P: Is the awareness of a point of consciousness - such as jealousy - is the awareness of that one thing, the totality of all consciousness?

Krishnamurti: When you use the word "aware", what do you

mean by that word "aware"? If you mean aware of the implications - in which there is no choice, no will, no compulsion, no resistance - obviously it is so.

P: So at any point this is possible?

Krishnamurti: Of course.

P: Yes, because that is the door; the door of dissolution.

Krishnamurti: No. Hold it a minute.

P: I used that word "door" deliberately.

Krishnamurti: Hold on. Let us begin slowly because I want to go step by step. My consciousness is made up of all this. My consciousness is part of the whole, both at the superficial and at the deeper level and you are asking, is there any awareness which is so penetrating that in that very awareness the whole is present? Or is it bit by bit? Is there a search, is there a looking in, an analysing?

D: The yogic position is that nature is a flowing river. In that flow, man's organism comes into being. As soon as it comes into being, it has also the capacity to choose and the moment it chooses, it separates itself from the now, from the river. This is a process of separation from the flow and the only thing which brings this into being is choice. Therefore, they say the dissolution of choice may bring you to total emptiness and in that emptiness you see.

Krishnamurti: Right sir, that is one point. "P"s question was, is this awareness, this process of stripping bit by bit? Is this awareness in which there is no choice, the total? Does it empty the whole of consciousness? Does it go beyond consciousness?

F: Supposing I cease to choose, is that stripping?

P: Is there an end to stripping?

Krishnamurti: Or is it a constant process?

P: And the second question was where there is intelligence is there stripping?

Krishnamurti: Let us start with the first question which is good enough. What do you say? Discuss it.

P: It is one of those extraordinary questions where you can neither say "Yes" nor "No".

D: It hangs on time or no time. If it is invited, it is time.

P: If you say it is not a question of time then it is not a process. five minutes later it will emerge again. So this question cannot be answered.

Krishnamurti: I am not sure. Let us begin again.

My consciousness is made up of all this. My consciousness is used to the process of time, my consciousness thinks in terms of gradualness, my consciousness is practice and through practice to achieve, which is time. My consciousness is a process of time.

Now I am asking that consciousness, can it go beyond this? Can we, who are caught in the movement of time, go beyond time?

That question, consciousness cannot answer.

Consciousness does not know what it means, because it can only think in terms of time and when questioned whether this process can end in which there is no time, it cannot answer, can it?

Now as consciousness cannot answer the question, we say let us see what is awareness and investigate whether that awareness can bring about a timeless state? But this brings in new elements. What is awareness? Is it within the field of time, is it outside the field of time?

Now what is awareness? Is there in awareness any choice, explanation, justification, or condemnation? Or is there the

observer, the chooser? And if there is, is that awareness? So is there an awareness in which there is no observer at all?

Obviously.

I am aware of that lamp and I do not have to choose when I am aware of that lamp.

Is there an awareness in which the observer is totally absent? Not a continuous state of awareness in which the observer is absent, which again is a fallacious statement.

A: The word is swarupa shunyata. The observer becomes empty. He is stripped.

Krishnamurti: Now is that awareness to be cultivated which implies time? How does this awareness come into being in which there is no observer? Are we meeting each other?

How is this awareness to come about? Is it the result of time? If it is, then it is part of consciousness in which choice exists.

And you say awareness is not choice. It is observation in which there is no observer.

Now how is that to come about without consciousness interfering? Or does it come out of consciousness? Does it flower out of consciousness? Or is it free of consciousness?

D: It is free of consciousness.

P: I want to ask two things. Does it come about when I ask the question "who am I?"

Krishnamurti: All the traditionalists have asked that question.

P: But it is an essential question. When I really try to investigate the source of the ego itself, that is the one question. Or does awareness come about when one tries to discover the observer?

Krishnamurti: No. The moment you try, you are in time.

P: It is a question of language, of semantics. You can strip at any point. Where is the observer? We are taking for granted that the observer "is".

Krishnamurti: Let us begin slowly. One sees what consciousness is. Any movement within that field, any movement is still a process of time. It may try to be or not to be, it may try to go beyond, it may try to invent something beyond consciousness, but it is still part of time. So I am stuck.

P: I want to use words which are not your words. So I have rejected all your words. I have to use my own instruments. What is the element in me which seems to me the most potent and powerful: It is the sense of the "I".

Krishnamurti: Which is the past.

P: I will not use your language. It is very interesting not to use your language. I say the most potent thing is the sense of the "I"? Now can there be a perception of the "I"?

F: That is a wrong question. I will tell you why. You ask can I perceive the "I"?

Now the "I" is nothing but an insatiable hunger for experience.

Krishnamurti: "P" began by asking "who am I?" Is the "me", the "I" an action of consciousness?

P: So I say let us look, let us investigate.

Krishnamurti: When I ask myself "who am I?", is that the central factor in consciousness?

P: It seems so. And then I say let me see the "I", let me find it, perceive it, touch it.

Krishnamurti: So you are asking, is this central factor perceivable sensorily?

Is the central factor tactile, to be felt, to be tasted? Or is that central factor, the "I", something which the senses have invented.

P: That comes later. First of all, I see whether it is tactile.

Krishnamurti: When I have asked the question, "who am I?", one must also question who is investigating, who is asking the question "who am I?".

P: I do not ask that question. I have asked that question over and over again. I have discussed awareness endlessly. I leave it, because the one thing which you have said is, do not accept one word which is not your own. I start looking. Is this "I" which is the central core of myself, is it tactile? I observe it in the surface layers, in the depth layers of my consciousness, in the hidden darkness and as I unfold it what takes place is a light within, an explosion, an extension within. Another factor that operates is that which has been exclusive becomes inclusive. So far I have been exclusive, now the world movement flows in.

Krishnamurti: We see that.

P: And I find this is not something which can be touched, perceived. What can be perceived is that which has been, which is a manifestation of this "I". I see I had a thought of this "I" in action, but it is already over. Then I explore - from where does thought emerge? Can I find the springs of thought? Or where does thought go? Can I pursue a thought? How far can I go with a thought? How far can I hold a thought? Can thought be held in consciousness? These are tangible things which I think the individual has to completely feel for himself.

Krishnamurti: We have gone through this. I thought we had done all this.

F: I say all this is awareness.

Krishnamurti: Let us be simple. When I ask "who am I?", who is asking the question? And one finds on investigation that the "I" is not observable, touchable, hearable, and so on. And so, is the "I" within the field of the senses? Or have the senses created the "I"?

P: The very fact that it is not within the field of the senses.....

Krishnamurti: Do not move away from that. Is it not also within the field of the senses? We jump too quickly.

Is perceiving a visual perception or something else?

D: We are going into the nature of awareness. Now how does awareness arise?

P: I want to put aside everything Krishnaji has said and I find that the very enquiry, that the very investigation into the "I" creates light, intelligence.

Krishnamurti: You are saying, the very enquiry brings about awareness. Obviously I did not say it did not.

P: And in the enquiry one can only use certain instruments which are the senses. Whether the enquiry is outside or within, the only instruments which can be used are the senses, because that is all we know - the seeing, listening, feeling - and the field is illuminated. The field of the without and the field of the within is illuminated. Now in this state of illumination, you suddenly find that there has been a thought, but that it is already over.

Krishnamurti: Thought exists in the field of relationship and observation. It does not exist by itself. It exists in observing relationship - the lamp.

P: In this, if you ask is there a partial or total stripping, the question is irrelevant. It has no meaning.



Krishnamurti: Wait a minute. I am not sure. Is perception partial? I have investigated through the senses, the senses creating the "I", investigating the "I". The activity brings a lightness, clarity. Not entire clarity, but some clarity.

P: I will not use the word some clarity, but clarity.

Krishnamurti: It brings clarity. We will stick to that. Is that clarity expandable?

P: The nature of seeing is such, I can see here, and I can see there, depending on the power of the eye.

Krishnamurti: We said perception is not only visual but also non-visual. We said perception is that which illuminates.

P: Here I would like to ask something. You have said that seeing is not only visual but non-visual. What is the nature of this non-visual seeing?

Krishnamurti: It is non-visual which is non-thinkable. It does not pertain to the word. It does not pertain to thought. That is all.

Is visual perception non-verbal perception?

The non-visual perception is the perception without the meaning, the expression, the thought.

Is there a perception without thought? Now proceed.

P: And that also is not such a difficult thing. I see there is such perception. Now that perception can see close, can see far.

Krishnamurti: Wait. Perception. We are talking only of perception. Not the duration, length, size or breadth of perception, but perception which is non-visual which is not deep perception or shallow perception. Shallow perception or deep perception comes only when thought interferes.

P: Now in that is there partial stripping or total stripping? We

started with that.

Krishnamurti: When there is non-verbal perception, what are you asking? What are you asking further?

F: She is asking, in every perception, there is the non-verbal element of mere perception. Then there is the psychological superimposition. The stripping refers only to the psychological superimposition. Is there a state of mind in which superimposition does not occur and there is no stripping?

P: That is right. Perception is perception. We are asking is there a perception in which stripping is not necessary?

Krishnamurti: There is no such thing as an everlasting perception.

Is it identical with what you call intelligence?

Krishnamurti: I do not know. Why are you asking that?

P: Because it is timeless.

Krishnamurti: Timeless means timeless. Why do you ask? Is perception which is non-verbal, is it not also non-time, non-thought? If you have answered this question you have answered that.

F: There is the momentary time of the "now". And there is another timeless in which one moves and lives.

Krishnamurti: I do not understand what you say.

F: Still, perception can be sensory.

Krishnamurti: Now is there perception that is non-verbal and therefore not pertaining to thought? Then what is the question? A mind that is perceiving is not asking this question, it is perceiving. And each perception is perception. It is not carrying over perception. Where does the question of stripping or not stripping

arise?

P: I say even in perception which is not linked with thought, perception is never carried into another thought. I see that lamp. The seeing has not been carried. Thought is only being carried.

Krishnamurti: That is obvious. My consciousness is my mind, is my brain cells, is the result of my sensory perceptions. That is my consciousness. That is all consciousness. That consciousness is the result of time, evolution, growth. It is expandable, contractable and so on. And thought is part of that. Now somebody comes along and asks "who am I?". Is the "I" the permanent entity in this consciousness?

D: It cannot be.

Krishnamurti: This "I" - is it consciousness?

D: It is not permanent.

Krishnamurti: Consciousness is heritage. Of course it is.

F: We are mixing the concept of consciousness, with the experience of consciousness.

Krishnamurti: This is very clear. "I" is that consciousness.

P: "I" has a great reality for me till I investigate.

Krishnamurti: Of course. The fact is after looking, observing, I see I am the whole of this consciousness. This is not a verbal statement. I am all that. I am the heritage. And is that "I" touchable, observable? Can it be felt, twisted? Is it the result of perception, of heritage?

F: It is not the result. It is the inherited.

Krishnamurti: And then she asks who is that "I"? Is that "I" part of consciousness, part of thought? I say yes. Thought is part of it. Thought is the "I", except where thought is functioning

technologically, where there is no "I". The moment you move away from the scientific field, you come to the "I" which is part of the biological heritage.

F: The "I" is the centre of perception, a working centre of perception, an ad hoc centre and the other is an effective centre.

Krishnamurti: Be simple. We see consciousness is the "I". The whole of that field is the "I". In the field, the "I" is the centre.

P: I want to put aside everything and tackle it in a new way. I see that the most important element in me is the "I". Now what is the "I"? What is its nature? One investigates that and in the very process of observation there is clarity.

Krishnamurti: Full stop.

P: Clarity being not eternal,.....

Krishnamurti: But it can pick it up again.

P: I say, maybe.

Krishnamurti: Because I have an idea that perception is whole.

P: Is it a question which legitimately arises in this state?

Krishnamurti: In the state of perception it does not arise. It only arises, exists when I ask, is this process eternal, everlasting?

P: And what would you say?

Krishnamurti: You are being asked. Answer. Wait. You have to answer this question. At the moment of perception the question does not arise. The next moment I do not perceive so clearly.

P: If I am alert to see that I am not perceiving so clearly, I will investigate that.

Krishnamurti: So what am I doing? There is perception. That is all.

P: The doorway is in the question. The "key" of the doorway is

in that question.

Krishnamurti: Let us be simple about this. There is perception. In that perception there is no question of duration. There is only perception. The next minute I do not see clearly. There is no clear perception. It is muddled. There is investigation of pollution and so clarity. Right? And again perception; move again; cover and uncover - and this goes on. This is going on.

F: Is it a movement of time?

P: A very interesting thing takes place. The very nature of this awareness is that it operates on the "other".

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by the "other"?

P: Inattention.

Krishnamurti: Wait. Attention and inattention. Then be aware of inattention which becomes attention. This balancing is going on all the time.

P: I observe the very nature of attention. It has its own action on inattention. Now if I make a statement "it lessens inattention" it would be an incorrect thing for me to say. The only thing I can observe is that there is an action of attention on inattention.

Krishnamurti: Does that action on inattention wipe away inattention so that inattention does not come again?

D: It is attentive to the inattentive.

P: I am going further than being attentive to the inattentive. I say the nature of this attention is such that it operates on the brain cells. I am very very hesitant when I say this. It is the nature of attention to operate on the brain cells. That which is dormant in the brain-cells - which re-emerges when it is exposed to attention, the very nature of the dormancy undergoes a change. I would like this

area to be investigated.

Krishnamurti: Let us begin again. Awareness - if there is choice in that awareness we are back again in consciousness.

Awareness is non-verbal. Awareness has no relationship to thought. That awareness we call attention. What takes place when there is inattention: there is inattention. Why do you mix the two?

I am inattentive; there is no attention; that is all.

In that inattention there are certain actions going on. And those activities bring further misery, confusion, trouble. So I say to myself, I must be attentive all the time so as to prevent this disturbance taking place and I say I have to cultivate attention and therefore that very cultivation becomes inattention. The seeing of that inattention brings attention.

Attention affects the brain cells.

Look what has happened. There is attention, and then inattention. In inattention there is confusion, misery, and all the rest of it. Now what takes place?

D: Dispelling of inattention has gone down in the unconscious.

P: Is it not really that you can do nothing about it?

Krishnamurti: I agree "P"; hold on a minute. Do not say there is nothing. We will find out. We are investigating. There is attention and there is inattention. In inattention everything is confusion. Why do I want to put the two together? When there is the urge to put the two together, then there is an action of will which is choice. I prefer attention; I do not prefer inattention - so I am back again in the field of consciousness.

So what is the action where the two are never brought together?

I want to explore it a little bit.

When there is attention, thought as memory does not operate. There is no thinking process in attention. There is only attention. I am only aware that I have been inattentive when the action produces discomfort, misery or danger. Then I say to myself, I have been inattentive and as attention has left a mark on the brain I am concerned with the misery which inattention has brought about. Then in investigating that misery, attention comes again leaving no mark. So what is taking place? Actually what is taking place? Each time there is inattention there is quick, instant perception of inattention. Therefore perception is not of duration, of time. Perception and attention leave no mark. The immediacy of perception is always taking place.

## **TRADITION AND REVOLUTION DIALOGUE 30 BOMBAY 19TH FEBRUARY 1971 'THE MIND AND THE HEART'**

Questioner P: We have talked several times, and so far the discussions have been related to the mind and its problems. What we have not discussed is the movement of the heart.

Krishnamurti: I am glad you have raised that.

P: Is the movement of the heart a different movement from the movement of the mind? Are they one movement or two movements? And if they are two movements, what are the elements which make these two movements different? I use the words mind and heart, because these are the two focal points around which certain sensory responses appear to focus. Are the two movements in fact one movement?

Krishnamurti: Let us begin. What do you mean by movement?

P: Any kind of emotional response which we call love, affection, goodwill, compassion, seems to ripple, to move from a focal point which we identify as the region of the heart. These ripples affect the heart, make it physically beat faster.

Krishnamurti: Which is the physical, the physiological movement of the brain cells?

D: Or is it the nerves which have an impact on the heart?

Krishnamurti: It is a response of the nerves, the heart, the brain, the whole organism, the psychosomatic organism. Now, is the movement of the mind separate from the movement which is generally called the heart? We are not speaking of the physical heart, but of the emotions, the sentiments, the angers, the jealousy,



the feeling of guilt - all the emotions that make the heart throb and beat faster. Are the movements of the mind and heart separate? Let us discuss it.

P: What we have been saying all along is that if one can strip oneself till nothing remains but the movement of survival, the only factor which distinguishes man is this strange movement of the heart.

Krishnamurti: I think this division is artificial. First of all, we should not start that way.

P: While we have been discussing with you, there has been a silencing of the brain cells, there has been tremendous clarity, yet there has been no response from the heart; there have been no ripples. Krishnamurti: So you are separating the two. There is the movement of the mind and the movement of the heart: let us question whether they are separate? And if they are not separate, then when the mind is empty of consciousness in the sense in which we have used that word, what is the quality of the mind that is compassion - that is love, empathy? Let us begin by asking whether the movement of the heart is separate. Is any movement separate?

P: What identity has anger with the movement of affection?

Krishnamurti: I am asking, is any movement separate?

P: Separate from what?

Krishnamurti: Is all movement unitary, like all energy is unitary, though we may divide it up, fragment it?

All movement is one; a unitary movement. One has broken movement up as the movement of the heart, the movement of different categories; but we are asking, "Is the movement of the

heart separate from the movement of the mind?" Is there such a movement of the heart separate from the mind, mind being the brain? I do not know if I can verbalize this - the mind, the heart, the brain, are they one unit? And from that unit, movement flows; a movement which is unitary. But we divide emotions, sentiments, devotion, tenderness, compassion, enthusiasm from their opposites.

P: As also evil, cruelty, vanity. There is a pure intellectual movement which is neither one nor the other; the pure technological movement.

Krishnamurti: Is the technological movement different from the movement of the mind?

P: I think thought has its own technology. It has its own momentum, it has its own reason for existence, its own direction, its own speed at which it operates, its own motives and its own energy.

F: You cannot measure thought. Do not call it technology.

D: Thought-waves have been measured. Technology means measurable.

Krishnamurti: We said just now that compassion, love, tenderness, care, consideration and politeness are one movement. The opposite movement is contrary to that - it is violence and all that. So there is the movement of the mind, the movement of affection, love and compassion; and the movement of violence. So there are now three movements. Then there is another movement which says this must be or this must not be; has the assertion that this must be or this must not be, anything whatsoever to do with the mental movement?

D: Then there is the movement of the coordinator apart from the

three.

Krishnamurti: Now we have the fourth movement - the coordinator. The movement of affection as the movement of the heart, then the movement of violence, callousness, depression, vulgarity and all that; then the mental, intellectual movement and the movement of the coordinator. So there are now four movements and every one of these movements has its own subdivisions.

See how complex it becomes, and each subdivision is in contradiction with its opposite. So it becomes multiple. This psychosomatic organism has got dozens of contradictions, not just mental movements, intellectual movements, emotional movements, etc. There are simultaneous and contradictory movements, multitudinous movements and there is the coordinator trying to arrange things so that he can operate.

F: Is there not a selective mechanism, which picks up and calls it thought, mind, heart and so on? Is that not the coordinator?

Krishnamurti: Coordinator, chooser, integrater, selector, call it what you will, they are all in contradiction with each other.

F: Why do you say they are in contradiction, because each one is an independent movement?

D: But as one lives they seem to be in contradiction.

F: But each one is moving in its own.

P: As "F" says, at any given point if one is, the other is not.

F: Then there cannot be contradiction.

Krishnamurti: When one is, the other is not. But the coordinator weighs these two - I want this and I do not want that.

F: That is the whole movement of life.

P: We started by saying that so far we have gone into the movement of the mind. Is there such a thing as the movement of the heart?

B: Is it a nourishing movement? Is it a movement of sustenance - this which we call the movement of the heart? Is this not necessary in order to see that the movement of the brain does not remain sterile?

D: We are not in the field of contradiction at all.

Krishnamurti: Contradiction is not when one is, and the other is not, but when the coordinator says I would rather not have this but have that; then begins the contradiction, the opposition as choice.

A: If I am full of hate, etc., I cannot take two steps beyond. The question is, is the movement of the heart distinct from that of the mind? Or does it have its own quality?

Krishnamurti: That is what "P" is saying. There is the movement of the mind, the intellectual, technological movement; there is the movement of the heart and there is the movement of violence. Then there are several multitudinous movements in us and the coordinator selects one or two to sustain himself. From there what is the next question?

P: Are these movements parallel to each other? Ultimately they are either the one movement or the other.

Krishnamurti: I am not sure.

P: Is the movement of the brain basically that which excites emotions?

A: Though one may not have personal hate or anger, when I read about Bengal, certain emotions come and they are social responses. I do not do a thing about it, whereas to have love,

affection is a definite quality of enrichment; a sustenance; which the mind cannot give you.

D: We have already agreed that the perception of the brain is thought. Krishnamurti: Let us get the meaning of the words clear. The response to various forms of stimuli we call emotion.

Is perception an emotion?

Now what is the next question? You ask, are there two movements with their subdivisions; are they parallel?

P: Parallel means separate; they never meet.

Krishnamurti: Or are they really one which we do not know?

P: Take desire. Which category would you put it in - emotion or thought?

B: Desire is from the heart.

P: Take the arising of desire. After a while it becomes thought. Where will you put it?

A: It arises only as a thought.

F: The arising of desire as an immediate emotional response of the heart, is not separate from thought. With the word "anger", the heart beats faster. All that is one movement.

Krishnamurti: Desire, hate, love, we say, are emotive and mental movements. Therefore there are these two movements. You ask, are they parallel and therefore separate or is it all one movement? I am not saying it is or it is not so.

P: I think that is not a valid question. The valid question is if they are two separate movements, is it impossible for them ever to come together? Or is it the very cause of the misfortune that we have kept them separate?

F: That which perceives the pattern is thought. That which

perceives without the pattern is emotion.

P: The moment you make such a statement either this is so to us and therefore the duality has ceased, or otherwise it is a theory.

Krishnamurti: It is a theory. Conclusions, formulas mean nothing. I say I do not know. I know only these two movements the one the thinking, the intellectual, the rational movement; the second the feeling of kindness, gentleness, that is all. Are they two separate movements? Or because we have treated them as two separate movements, our whole misfortune, our confusion arises. You see, "P", you can see we have till now divided the body and the soul. The whole religious tendency in the west as well as in the east has been this division of the soul and the body and we have maintained that and the scriptures have maintained that. It is really a psychosomatic state, not one or the other, but it is a psychosomatic movement which invents the soul, etc. And so the question is, are they two movements or have we accustomed ourselves to the thought that the two are separate - the body and the soul - till somebody says it is a psychosomatic state and I say "yes", I understand.

P: But how can you neglect the fact that an emotional intensity brings a new quality of being, a complete experience of what the other person feels; a sense of unspoken understanding?

Krishnamurti: Do not bring that in yet. We are asking, are these two movements separate? Or because we are so habit-ridden we have accepted that they are two separate movements? If they are not, what is the one unitary movement that includes thought as the movement of the brain and the movement of the heart?

How do you investigate this question?

I can only investigate it from fact to fact. I can have no theories about it. I see the fact of perception. I see the fact of the movement of thought. And I ask when there is no movement of thought, is there a movement which is nonverbal? Have I explained myself?

If there is complete cessation of thinking which is movement, is there a movement which is an emotive movement as love, devotion, tenderness, care? Is there a movement separate from thought; thought being verbal meaning, explanation, description, etc? Or when the movement of thought comes to an end without any compulsion, is there not a totally different movement which is not that or this?

P: That is so, Sir, and I am saying this very very hesitantly. There is a state when it is as if an elixir is released, when one is overflowing; a state in which the heart is the only thing that is there - I am using metaphors - and there can be action in that state, doing in it, thinking in it, and everything in it, and there is a state when thought has ceased and the mind is very clear and alert, but the elixir is not present.

Krishnamurti: Let us stick to one thing. Just what is the factor of division?

P: What divides is an actual tactile sense. Here it is not something which is mental. There is a certain ripple; a ripple is very real.

Krishnamurti: I am not talking about that. What is the factor in us that divides one as the emotive movement and the other as the intellectual-thought movement? Why is there the soul and the body?

D: Would you admit that the very faculty of intellect sees that

there is a movement which emerges from thought and another that emerges from the heart. It is observable.

Krishnamurti: I say, why is there a division?

D: The hand is different from the leg.

Krishnamurti: They have different functions.

D: There is the function of the brain and there is the function of the heart.

A: As far as my experience goes, when the verbal movement ceases, there is an awareness of the entire body in which emotional content is and it is pure feeling. It is no more thinking, but pure feeling.

P: In the tradition there is a word called Rasa. It is very close to what Krishnaji says. But rasa is a word which needs to be investigated. Rasa is essence, it is that which fills. The tradition differentiates different types of rasa but rasa is essence; that which fills, that which permeates.

D: It is emotion.

P: It is much more; rasa is essence.

Krishnamurti: Keep to that word essence, perfume. Essence means what it is. Now what happens? In observing the whole movement of thought, in observing the content of consciousness, the essence comes out of it. And in observing the movement of the heart, in that perception, there is the essence. Essence is the same whether it is this or that.

A: That is what the Buddhists also say.

Krishnamurti: When you use the word "essence", it is the essence of all the flowers that makes the perfume and the quality. In perceiving the whole movement of thought as consciousness -



consciousness with its content which is consciousness - and in observing that, in that very observation is the external refinement which is the essence. Right? In the same way there is the perception of the whole movement of the body, love, joy. When you perceive all that, there is the essence and in that there are no two essences.

Essence has to come into being. Now how do you produce it? Distil it? When the flowers are distilled, the essence of the flowers is the perfume.

D: When the pollution goes, it is essence.

F: There is the essence of friendship, of affection.

Krishnamurti: No, no, I would not use essence of friendship, essence of jealousy. No, no.

F: What do you mean by essence?

Krishnamurti: Just look. I have watched what we have been doing during these discussions. We have observed the movement of thought as consciousness; the whole of it and the content of the movement is consciousness. There is perception of that. The perception is the distillation of that and that we call essence which is pure intelligence. It is not my intelligence or your intelligence but it is intelligence, it is essence. And when we observe the movement of love, hate, pleasure, fear, which are all emotive, there is perception and, as you perceive, the essence comes out of that. There are no two essences.

D: Here comes my question. What is the relationship between essence as you perceive it and uniqueness? I think they are interchangeable.

Krishnamurti: I think I would rather use the word essence.

P: The great masters of alchemy were called rasa-siddhas.

D: They who are established in rasa, that is, those who have attained, who have their being in that.

Krishnamurti: During these days and before, one has watched the movement of thought. One has watched it, and watched it without any choice and in that is the essence; out of that choiceless observation comes the essence of the one and the essence of the other. Therefore what is this essence? Is it a refinement of emotions, or is it totally unrelated? And yet it is related because it has been observed. Right?

P: So energy which is attention....

Krishnamurti: Energy is essence.

P: Though operating on matter, essence is unrelated to both.

Krishnamurti: Let us begin again slowly with essence. Is it unrelated to consciousness? I am taking it that one has observed consciousness.

There has been a perception of movement as consciousness, as thought and the content of that consciousness which is time and the very observation of that, the flame of observation distils. Right?

In the same way the flame of perception brings the essence of emotive movement. Now having this essence, what relationship has it to that and to this?

I do not know if you see this. That was your question. Right? None whatsoever. Essence has nothing to do with the flower. Right. Though it is part of the flower, the essence is not of it.

F: Even grammatically it is not all right: although it is part of the flower it is not of the flower.

Krishnamurti: Look, Sir, the other day I saw they were taking

the bark of a tree to produce some kind of alcohol; that essence is not the bark.

F: But it is in the bark.

D: It is realized because of the heat.

Krishnamurti: Heat of perception produces essence. So what is the question? Is essence related to consciousness? Obviously not. So the whole point in this is the flame of perception and the flame of perception is the essence.

D: It creates the essence and it is the essence.

Krishnamurti: It is the essence.

P: Is perception creation, the moment of creation?

D: Do we create what we perceive?

P: Is perception creation?

Krishnamurti: I do not know what you mean by creation.

P: Bringing into being something which is not there.

Krishnamurti: Is perception creation? What do you mean by creation? I know what perception means. Let us stick to that word. I do not know what the meaning of creation is. Producing a baby? Baking bread?

D: No, I would not say that. Moving from here to there is also producing.

Krishnamurti: Do not reduce everything to creation. Going to office is not creation. You are asking what is creation? To create, to produce, to create something which has not existed before. When we use the word "creation", to create something different, to create a statue, to bring into being, what does that mean? Is it essence? To bring into being what? It can bring into being only two things: thought or emotion.

D: Bringing into being means, essence manifest.

Krishnamurti: I ask of you what is meant by creation? I do not know. Bringing into being something new or bringing into being in the mould of the known.

P: Creation must be bringing into being the new, not the old.

Krishnamurti: Therefore let us be clear. Bringing into being something totally new. At what level? Watch it. At the sensory level, at the intellectual level, at the memory level; where? Bringing into being something new; where? So that you see it, so that you can visualize it? The man who produced the jet because he was familiar with the piston, the internal combustion engine, was that totally new? So when you say bringing into being something totally new, at what level?

P: At the sensory level.

Krishnamurti: At the sensory? Can you paint a new picture which is non-verbal? Can you paint something that is totally new? Which is, can you bring into being something which is not self-expression? It is not new if it is self-expression.

P: If creation is something entirely new which is unrelated to any self-expression, then probably all self-expression ceases, all manifestation ceases.

Krishnamurti: Wait, wait.

P: I will say that because there does not exist anything which is not self-expression.....

Krishnamurti: That is what I want to get at. The man who discovered the jet - at the moment when he discovered it, there was no self-expression. He translated it into self-expression. It is something discovered, then it is put into a formula. I only know

that the flame of perception has brought about the essence, and now the question is, has that essence any expression? Does it create anything new?

D: It creates a new perception.

Krishnamurti: No. There is no new perception. The flame is the perception. Flame is flame all the time. One moment pure flame of perception, then forgotten, and again pure flame of perception, then forgotten. Each time the flame is new.

D: Perception touches matter, and there is an explosion and there is mutation. Now that which emerges out of it, you cannot postulate. It is the discovery of the jet engine.

Krishnamurti: Let us put it this way. In that essence when there is action, that essence is not concerned with self-expression. It is concerned with action. Action then is total, not partial.

P: I want to ask one more question. The manifestation of this.....

Krishnamurti: Which is action.

P: It has contact with matter.

Krishnamurti: There is action.

A: Up to perception we go with you.

Krishnamurti: No, Sir. You have gone further. There is a perception which is flame, which has distilled the essence. You cannot say I have got it. There is only essence. Now that essence acts or may not act. If it acts, it has no frontiers at all. There is no "me" acting. Obviously.

P: That itself is creation. Creation is not something apart from that.

Krishnamurti: The very expression of that essence is creation in

action, not new action or old action. The essence is expression.

P: Then is perception also action? Krishnamurti: Of course. See the beauty of it. Forget action. See what has taken place in you.

Perception without any qualification is a flame. It distils whatever it perceives. Whatever it perceives it distils because it is the flame.

It is not a sensory perception. When there is that perception which distils at every minute, when you say I am a fool, to perceive that - and in that perception there is the essence - that essence acts or it does not act, depending upon the environment, depending upon where it is; but in that action there is no "me", there is no motive at all.

BOMBAY 19th February, 1971

*Tradition and Revolution* consists of a series of dialogues on ancient Indian religious and philosophical themes. Man's search for liberation, his ideas about the spiritual path and the goal, and various traditional concepts are dealt with in contemporary idiom. Krishnamurti's concern is to bring out the experiential component behind these terms and to lead his listeners to the heart of the human predicament. These dialogues are a profound investigation into the nature of consciousness, an exploration of the mind, its movement and its frontiers, and of that which lies beyond.

Philosophy / Religion

---

ISBN 81-87326-07-7

Price Rs 125/-