

[Chapter 1](#)

[Chapter 2](#)

[Chapter 3](#)

[Chapter 4](#)

[Chapter 5](#)

[Chapter 6](#)

[Chapter 7](#)

[Chapter 8](#)

[Chapter 9](#)

[Chapter 10](#)

[Chapter 11](#)

[Chapter 12](#)

[Chapter 13](#)

[Chapter 14](#)

[Chapter 15](#)

- Alternative Versions -

[Chapter 7](#)

[Chapter 11](#)

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 1

1ST PUBLIC TALK NEW DELHI 10TH

DECEMBER 1970

One of the most difficult things is to learn about communication. The word implies that we share together a common factor, that we think together about a problem. The word implies all that - taking a common factor that all of us have and examining it closely in communication, which means sharing together. So we are going to talk over together, which means you are sharing the problem, not merely receiving, not merely arguing, agreeing or disagreeing but examining together. Therefore it is as much your responsibility as that of the speaker.

The problem is the question of change. Everywhere you see, as you go around the world, you observe one common thing, that there must be a tremendous revolution - not the physical revolution, not throwing bombs, shedding blood, not revolt - because every physical revolution inevitably ends in bureaucratic dictatorship or the tyranny of the few. This is historical fact we don't even have to discuss; but what we have to talk about together is this question of inward revolution. There must be vast, profound changes not only in the outward structure of society but also inwardly, because the society in which we live, the culture in which we have been brought up is part of us. The social structure, the culture is what we have created.

So we are the culture and the culture is us. We are the world and the world is us. If you are born in a particular culture, you represent that culture. You are part of it and to change the structure

of that culture, you have to change yourself. A confused mind, a mind that is ideologically inclined or has deep convictions cannot possibly alter or bring about a change in the social structure. I think that's fairly clear. That is, you are the world, not in abstraction, not as an idea but in actuality. If you change the social structure, out of your confusion, out of your bigotry, out of your petty, narrow limited ideals and convictions what you will produce is further chaos, further misery.

So our problem is, is it possible for the human mind to undergo a radical change, a change that demands not an analytical process, not time, but rather an instantaneous change? Is it possible for the human mind to bring about the psychological revolution inwardly, and that's what we are going to examine, and that is what we are going to share together

Sharing implies that there is no teacher and disciple. We are not your authority, we are not pointing out what to do, but what we are concerned with is the examination and bringing about an understanding of this immense, complex problem. There must be a social change, because society is terribly corrupt. There is vast injustice, war, every kind of brutality, violence, and the human beings who live in a particular culture, in a particular society are part of that; and to bring about this radical change there must be a revolution in the psyche, in oneself.

So we together are going to consider this question, knowing that there must be a radical, psychological revolution, deeply, which will then affect the society in which we live. It must begin with the human mind, not with the structure which the human mind has created, whether it is the communist society or so called

democratic society, or the capitalist or the Maoist society.

So first we are asking whether this human mind, which is the result of time, of so-called evolution, which has lived through thousands of experiences, this mind that you have - the mind includes the brain, the heart, the whole being, the whole structure of the human being - whether that mind can radically change itself and not depend on its environment for change. Please see the importance of this. If you depend on the environment for change, the environment which is created by you, and therefore when you depend on the structure of a society for you to change, then you are deceiving yourself, you are living in an illusion, because you have created this society. So how is this possible for the human mind that is so conditioned? If you observe your own mind, you will see that it is heavily conditioned as a Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, communist, Maoist or whatever it is. This mind which is the result of conditioning - and the conditioning is the past - how can such a mind bring about in itself a total change? And that is what we are going to consider right through these talks. Is it possible to change through analytical process? You understand? Is it possible for this conditioned mind to change itself through the analytical process, that is, analyse, examine and discover through analysis a way to bring about this revolution in the psyche?

Now Sirs, in listening to a talk of this kind, you are listening not to acquire knowledge but rather listening so that you will observe clearly. That is, there are two movements in learning. One movement is the accumulative movement - you study a language and acquire knowledge and that knowledge is the past, and according to that knowledge you act; that is, you act according to

what you have learnt, and what you have learnt is the past. Right? That is one way we learn, accumulate knowledge and act according to that, whereas there is another kind of learning which is not accumulating but moving, going along as we learn.

We were asking if the mind can change through analysis? Analysis implies an observer (the analyser) and the thing analysed. please observe it in yourself, don't listen to the speaker casually, superficially. We are saying where there is analysis, there is the observer (the analyser) and the thing to be analysed. In that there is division. Now, wherever there is division there must be conflict not only physically but psychologically. When there is a division between the Hindu and the Muslim there must be conflict. And when there is a division between the analyser and the thing analysed there must be conflict. Then the analyser, in analysing the thing he has observed in himself begins to correct, dominate it, suppress it.

All our religious, sociological training, conditioning, is to analyse step by step, is to progress slowly. That is our upbringing, and I assure you, that will never bring about a change. Analysis is a postponement of action. So will analysis, which is this dualistic examination by the analyser, will that bring about a deep fundamental change? And who is the analyser? Is the analyser different from the thing analysed? All our life is an action in fragmentation. We are fragmented human beings outwardly as well as inwardly. Look at what is happening in India and in the world - the South against the North, East against the West, the anti-Brahmins - you know what is going on in this country. Fragmentation is going on all the time, not only in the country, but

in religion - the Catholic against the Protestant, the Hindu against the Muslim, and so on, in private life and in public life. In private life you are one thing, in public you are another. So you live in fragmentation. Please observe this. You are not being taught by me. You can see this happening right through the world and inwardly also this takes place, this fragmentation, which is the observer and the observed, the analyser and the thing he analyses.

Now, is the analyser different from the thing he analyses? The analyser examines his anger, his jealousy, his ambition, his greed, his brutality, in order to get over it or in order to suppress it or in order to resist it. He examines in order to produce a result negatively or positively. Who is the examiner and the thing examined? You are following all this? Who is the examiner, who is the analyser? Is he not one of the fragments of the many fragments? He may call himself the superfragment, he may call himself the mind, the intelligence, but he is still a fragment. He may call himself the Atman or whatever you like to call it. It is still a super-fragment. Is that clear? It is not a question of agreement or disagreement, but observing what goes on in your lives, because you have to change your life, your living - not your ideas, your conclusions, your convictions.

So is the observer, the analyser, different from the analysed? Or are they not both the same? please, it is important that we understand this very clearly and deeply, because if they are both the same, then conflict comes to an end. You follow this?

Look, from the moment we are born till we die, we are in conflict. We are struggling and we have never been able to solve that problem, and we say that as long as there is division between

the analyser and the thing analysed there must inevitably be in conflict, because the analyser is the past. He has acquired knowledge through various experiences, through various influences; he is the past, he is the censor who judges, says this is right, this is wrong, this should be, this should not be. Right? And the censor then dictates to that thing which he observes, what it should do, what it should not do; how he should suppress it, go beyond it according to his past conditioning.

Probably you are not used to this kind of examination. Unfortunately, you have too many gurus in this country. They have told you what to do, what to think, what to practise. They are the dictators, and therefore, you have stopped thinking clearly. Gurus destroy, not create. If you really saw that, you would drop all spiritual authority completely, you wouldn't follow anybody including the speaker; you would really observe with your heart, with your mind, find out, examine, because it is you who have to change, not your guru. The moment he asserts he is a guru, he ceases to understand; he is no longer a man of truth.

So the past, which is the censor, which is the analyser, examines. So the past creates the division. And also, analysis implies time. It involves time, that is, you will take days, months, years in analysing, examining, and therefore there is no complete action. Please do understand this - a mind that is introspective, a mind that merely follows, a mind that functions according to the past, the analyser, his action is always incomplete and therefore always confusing and therefore bringing misery. So, you see for yourself the truth that analysis is not the way, that it is introspective, finding out the cause-all that implies time, taking

many days, many months. And before you know where you are, you are already dead.

So if you see the truth of it, that analysis is not the way for freedom, for a mind to become completely free of its conditioning, then you will drop the analytical process completely. If you see the danger of analysis as you see the danger of a serpent, actually see the danger of it, then you will never touch it. The mind is free from the idea of analysis. Therefore it has already a different quality, it is capable then of looking in another direction, because the old direction, the old tradition, the methods, the systems that you have, that the gurus offer and the books offer is this gradual process which is a form of analysis. When you see the truth of it, you are completely out of that. Therefore your mind has become much sharper, much clearer.

Truth is not something far away. It is there, only you must know how to look. A mind that is prejudiced, a mind that is burdened with conclusions, with beliefs, cannot possibly see, and one of our great prejudices is this analytical process. You see, and therefore you drop it. Then if you have dropped it, it no longer captures you; you are no longer thinking in terms of advancement, of suppression, resistance, because all that is implied in analysis.

Then if analysis is not the way to bring about a radical, psychological revolution, then is there another way, that is, is there another method, another system by which the conditioning can be put aside totally so that the mind is free? The mind can never be free as long as there is any kind of effort, because all our lives we are used to making effort - "I must be this, I shall be that, I shall achieve, I shall become" - and in that process tremendous effort is

involved. Effort implies either suppression or adjustment or resistance. Are you following all this?

That is, we are slaves to the verb "to be". I do not know if you have noticed it in yourself, how you think that you will be something, that you will achieve, that you will be free. That verb "to be" conditions the mind, you follow? That is, the verb "to be" implies the past, the present and the future - "having been", "will be" or "I am". Watch it in yourself, please - that is one of our major conditionings. Now can the mind be free of that whole movement, because psychologically, is there a tomorrow? You understand my question? You understand there is tomorrow by the watch, but is there a tomorrow inwardly, psychologically and actually, not the thought which creates tomorrow psychologically? There is a tomorrow which is "I will be" psychologically only when there is this conditioning of the mind caught in the trap of becoming.

You know, one of our miseries in this country is that we have stopped thinking, reasoning. We've been fed by others, we have become secondhand human beings and that is why it is so difficult to talk freely to somebody. This needs clear thinking on both our parts, because this is a tremendous problem which we must resolve, that is, as long as there is this movement of becoming, the movement of - "I will be good, I will be noble, I will become non-violent, I will achieve" as long as there is this conditioning of becoming, there must be conflict. That is a fact, isn't it? So in becoming, there is conflict, isn't there? So conflict distorts the mind. Every form of conflict must inevitably twist the mind, and can the mind function healthily, sanely, with great expanse, with great beauty, with great intelligence without any effort? Do you

understand my question?

Look, Sir, your mind, now, if I may point out not critically, not in any way derogatorily, your mind, if you watch it carefully, is all the time thinking in terms of the future or the past, what it will become. As in an office, you think of becoming the manager - climbing, climbing till you reach - the director. In the same way, you think inwardly, that is, you will eventually be perfect, eventually become non-violent, eventually live at perfect peace. That is your habit, that is your tradition, that is what you have been brought up on. And you are being challenged now to look at it entirely differently, and you will find it very difficult.

You say to yourself, how can I possibly live in this mad world without effort? How can I live with myself, in myself, without the least movement of effort? Don't you ask that? Isn't that your life - this constant battle not only outwardly for security and all the rest of it but inwardly also this battle going on to become, to be, to change, to achieve? And where there is any form of effort there must be distortion, mustn't there?

So we are going to find out whether it is possible for the mind to live without effort at all and yet function, not vegetate. You have understood my question? You are putting this question to yourself, I am not putting it to you. All that you have known is effort, resistance, suppression, or following somebody - that is all you have known. And we are asking whether the mind that has accepted this system, this tradition, this way of living, can that mind cease to make effort altogether? Please understand, examine it together - you are not learning from me. You are not learning it from the speaker at all, you are learning through observation,

therefore it is yours, not mine. Is that clear?

Effort exists when there is duality. Duality means contradiction - "I am, I should be" - contradictory desires, contradictory purposes, contradictory ideas. Most human beings are violent. Now they have brought about the idea of not being violent, so that there is a contradiction - the fact and the ideal. Right? The fact is that human beings are violent, and the non-fact is the idea of non-violence. If there was no ideal at all, then you would deal with the fact, wouldn't you? Can you put away the ideal altogether and face "what is"? Can you be aware of your convictions, your formulas, your ideals and your hopes? Because, they prevent you from observing what is, which is violence. We do not know what to do with violence, therefore we have ideals. Now, as we are speaking have you put away your ideals? No, you haven't; you have your convictions, which means you live on ideas and words. When a man says "I am convinced of something", he is really not facing facts, he is not observing "what is", and if a man would change radically he must observe "what is." You see, that is one of the reasons why you have no energy, why you have no flame, because you are living in some vague abstraction.

So, can the mind be free of the future, the future being what you will be? The future is the verb "to be". So if you put away the future, you are then concerned with "what is". Then the problem arises, how to observe "what is"? Then your mind is clear to look. Your mind is not clear to look when you are looking somewhere in the future. Right? So the idealists are the most hypocritical people in the world. If I want to change, I must face "what is", not be concerned with what I should be; I mustn't be crippled with

conclusions, convictions, formulas, systems; I must know "what is" and how to deal with it.

Now arises the question, how am I to observe "what is?" You understand? You see, 'what should be' becomes the authority. The mind that is free of 'what should be' has no authority, therefore it is free from any kind of supposition which breeds authority, therefore the mind is free to observe actually "what is." Now how does it observe? What is the relationship between the observer and the thing it observes? You see the mind is now free from all ideals, from all conclusions, from all authority. Authority exists when there is a becoming, when the guru says to you or the book says to you "You will achieve, if you follow this system; do this and you will get that" - always in the future - avoidance of the present in contrast to the mind that is free from authority, free from every kind of concept. And then the question arises, how is the mind to observe actually "what is"? What is, is that human beings are violent. We can explain, give causes, find out the causes why human beings have become violent. That's fairly simple, and one can easily observe it. We can see it in the animal, and as we have come from the animal, and so on, we are aggressive, we are violent, partly by the culture in which we live, for which we are responsible. So we are in fact violent.

Now how does the mind observe this fact which is violence? How do you observe it? You are angry, you are jealous, you are envious, brutal, how do you observe that fact? Do you observe it as an observer and the thing observed? If you do, that is division. Is there an observer observing violence? How do you observe it, or is your observation a complete unitary process? That is, a process in

which there is no division between the observer and the observed. What is it? Do you observe the fact that you are violent or greedy, envious, whatever it is, separating yourself from the fact of fear, anger, and the observer saying "I am different from the thing observed?" Or do you see that the anger, jealousy or violence is part of the observer also? Therefore the observer is the observed. Do you see that? If you see that there is no division between the thing observed and the observer; that anger or jealousy is part of the observer, the observer is jealousy, if you see that without the division, conflict comes to an end.

Conflict exists as long as there is division - when you are a Hindu and there is another as a Muslim. When you are a Christian, there is Catholic and there is Protestant; when you are an Indian nationalist and somebody else is of another nation. When there is division of any kind between you and another there must be conflict, and that outward division also goes inward. There is the division between me and my activity, me that observes, "me" that says "I will become". So in that division there is conflict. A mind in conflict is never free, a mind in conflict is always distorted.

When you use the word "understand", not intellectually, since that has no value at all, but actually, you know you are with it completely; now that is part of meditation. This is meditation - to discover a way of living in which there is no conflict, no escape, no effort to go off to some fantastic mystical experiences but actually find out in daily life, the way of living in which the mind has never been touched by conflict; and that can only be when you understand, actually see, with your heart, with your mind, with your reason, with everything that you have, see that as long as

there is a division inwardly in the psyche, which must exist when you try to become something, when you are trying to become noble, when you are trying to become better, there must be conflict which prevents you from looking at "what is".

You know, goodness can never become something else. You cannot become better in goodness. You understand this? Goodness is now, it flowers now, not in the future.

So is it possible for the mind which is so conditioned by the past, by culture, to radically change when the mind completely sees the truth and the falseness of ideologies, sees the falseness of following, obeying? You obey in order to achieve. Right? So you put away altogether all authority. To understand this question of authority deeply, you have to understand, haven't you, not only the authority of law but the authority which comes inwardly through obedience. The word "obedience" comes from Latin, which means to hear. Now when you hear over and over again that you must have a guru - otherwise you can't possibly understand life or achieve enlightenment - you must follow somebody. When you hear that constantly repeated, you inevitably obey. So obedience implies following, which means authority, and a mind that is ridden with authority as yours is, can never live in freedom and therefore without any effort. Question: You, are using the words "you" and "your mind." Are they synonymous?

Krishnamurti: Now, is that the question? You and your mind, aren't they one? You, are you separate from your mind, are you the super-soul which is using the mind, are you the Atman using the mind? Now if you are the Atman, that is one of your conditionings, because in the New World they do not believe in any of that, they

have been brought up not to believe in all that, you have been brought up to believe in the Atman. That is all. You have been brought up to believe in God, and there are millions of people conditioned not to believe in God. Both are conditioned, you who believe in God, and the men who don't believe in God. You are conditioned, you can never find out what truth is if you are conditioned. You must drop your belief to find out. So the question is, are you your mind? Aren't you what you think you are, when you think you are a Sikh, a Buddhist, a Catholic, Communist? When you think that you will achieve heaven, that is your idea of what you are. So why do you separate yourself from what you are?

Question: You say when the mind ceases, nothing remains.

Krishnamurti: The speaker is supposed to have said that when the mind ceases nothing remains. Did the speaker say that? I am afraid he did not say that.

Question: Do you believe if there is anything beyond man?

Krishnamurti: You know the speaker has been saying, "Don't believe, find out, examine, discover for yourself" and at the end of an hour and a quarter, you ask the speaker, "Do you believe?" You want beliefs and you think you have solved the problem by having beliefs. You believe that there is something beyond. You don't know a thing about it, but you believe. You assume something as being real, accept something as being real, about which you know absolutely nothing. How can a confused mind, a mind in sorrow, a mind which is bitter, angry, how can such a mind find out if there is something beyond? But you believe readily, because that is one of your escapes about which you can quarrel endlessly. Question: Would you share with us what you call reality?

Krishnamurti: What I call reality? Sir, reality is not an opinion. It is not through opinions that you come to reality, it is not through beliefs that you come to reality. The mind must be completely empty to discover what reality is, and you cannot share when your mind is not equally intense, passionate, free to look. How can you share something of which you know nothing? But what we do know together is confusion, is sorrow, is our petty lives. Instead of understanding that, freeing ourselves from all that, you want to know what truth is. The truth is where you are, which is, when the mind is free from conflict. It is there for you to see it.

Question: I see that my mind is fragmented. I see very clearly that there is a division, there is the observer and the observed and there is conflict. I can't see how these two can come together.

Krishnamurti: Now we are going to share this question together. How do you observe a tree? How do you observe it? Do you see it through an image, the image being your knowledge of a particular tree, that is a mango or whatever it is? Do you look at that tree with an image that you have about the tree, which is the knowledge that you have? You understand my question? Do you look at your neighbour or at your wife or husband with the knowledge that you have, with the image that you have? You do, don't you? Someone looks at a communist because he has an idea, an image of what a communist is, or he looks at a Protestant with Catholic eyes or a Hindu with Hindu eyes at a Muslim; that is he looks through an image. So the image divides. If I am married and I have loved my wife or a friend for twenty years, naturally I have an image about that person built up - nagging, friendship, companionship, sex, pleasure, all that is involved - and that becomes the image through

which I look. So the image divides. Now the observer and the observed: the observer is the image, is the knowledge of the past, and he looks with that image at the thing he is observing.

Therefore, there is a division. Now, can the mind be free of that image? Of all images? You understand my question - can the mind which is in the habit of building images, can that mind be free of image-building? That is, the machinery which builds the image, can that come to an end? Now what is that machinery. Please, we are sharing the problem together. I am not instructing you. We are asking each other. What is this image, how is this image produced and what is it that sustains this image? Now the machinery that builds the image is inattention. You understand, Sir?

You insult me or flatter me. When you insult me, I react and that reaction builds the image. The reaction comes about when there is no attention. You follow? When I am not attending completely to your insult, this inattention breeds the image. When you call me an idiot, I react, which is, I am not fully attentive to what you are saying, and therefore the image is formed. But when I am completely attentive to what you are saying, there is no image forming. When you flatter me, I listen completely, with complete attention, which is to attend without any choice, to be aware without any choice, then there is no image-forming at all.

After all, image-forming is a way of not getting hurt. We won't go into that, because that leads to something else. So when somebody flatters or insults, you give complete attention at that moment, then you will see that there is no image, and having no image there is then no division between the observer and the observed.

Question: When there is anger there is no observer nor the observed, there is only that reaction of anger, and when I use the word "anger" that very verbal description of that feeling brings about the observer who is different from the observed.

Krishnamurti: Right, you see all this? Or are you getting tired? When you are angry, at that second, there is neither the observer nor the observed, "I must not be angry" or "I am not justified in being angry." Then there is the division between the observer and the observed but not at the moment of anger.

Now at the moment of any crisis there is neither the observer nor the observed, because the thing is demanding and we cannot live at that heightened intensity all the time. Therefore we resort to the observer and the observed.

From that arises a whole question, which is, can a mind live without any challenge whatsoever; most of us need challenges, otherwise we would go to sleep. Challenge means you are asked, pushed, demanded. So can you find out whether a man can live without any challenge at all, that is to have a mind that is completely awake?

Question: When you are attentive, then you form images, it is only when you are inattentive, you have no images.

Krishnamurti: Look, Sir, you insult me. I react to your insult. When you say I am an idiot, I say you are another - what takes place? You have left, by your insult, a mark on my mind, a mark, memory. When next time I meet you, you are not my friend. Right? It has left a mark. If you flatter me, that has also left a mark, and next time I meet you, you are my friend. That is, any imprint on the mind is the formation of an image, and we are pointing out

that when the mind is crowded with images, it is not free, and therefore must live in conflict.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 2 2ND PUBLIC TALK NEW DELHI 13TH DECEMBER 1970

Most of us do not ask fundamental questions and if we do, we expect others to answer them. We are going this evening if we may, to consider several problems, and I think they are fundamental ones. One of them is to observe the many fragments of life, the various activities, opposing each other, contradicting and bringing about a great deal of confusion. One asks if there is an action which can cover totally all these divergent, contradictory, fragmentary activities, because one observes in one's own life how we are broken up - politically, religiously, artistically, scientifically, commercially, and so on - all opposing each other, contradicting each other. Is there an action which can respond totally to every demand of life without being contradictory in itself? I do not know if you have ever even asked such a question.

Most of us live in our own particular little activity and try to make the best of it. If you are a politician - and I hope you aren't - then your world is very dependent on votes and you know all the rest of the nonsense that goes on in the name of politics; and if you are a religious person, you will have a number of beliefs, a way of meditation contradicting everything in your daily life; if you are an artist, you live totally apart from all this, absorbed in your own particular fancy, in your own beauty, in your own perception, and so on; and if you are a scientist, you live in the laboratory and just a normal human being outside, rather shoddy, competitive and all the rest of it; so seeing all this with which most of us must be quite

familiar, what is the action which can respond totally to every demand and yet remain non-contradictory, whole? Now, if you put that question to yourself, as we are doing now, what would be your answer? Because as we said the other day when we met here, we are sharing together the problem of our life, not intellectually, not verbally, but actually. And that is the meaning of communication - to consider together the common issue, the common issue being this question: is there an action, a way of living every day which can answer, whether you are an artist, scientist, businessman and so on - the question whether your life can be whole, so that there is no fragmentation and therefore no contradictory action?

If the question is clear, then how shall we find out such an action? By what method, by what system? If we are trying to find a method, a way of living by a system, according to a certain pattern, then that very pattern, that very system is contradictory. Please do understand this clearly. If I follow a particular system in order to bring about an action which will be whole, complete, full, rich and beautiful, such a system, such a method, becomes mechanical. My actions will be mechanical and therefore totally incomplete.

Therefore I must set aside all idea of following, of mechanical repetitive activity. And also I must find out whether thought can help to bring about such an action. You understand my question? You live a fragmentary life - you are different in the office and at home, you have private thoughts and public thoughts, and you see this wide gulf, this contradiction, this fragmentation and ask if thought can bridge all these various fragments, if thought can bring about an integration between all these factor? Can it?

So we have to find out what is the nature and the structure of

thought. Can thought, the thinking, the intellectual process of reasoning, can such thought bring about a harmonious life? To find out, one has to investigate, examine carefully, the nature and structure of thought, which means we are going together to examine your thinking, not the description or the explanation of the speaker, because the description is never the described, the explanation is not the explained. So don't let us be caught in the explanation or in the description, but together investigate, find out how thought works, and whether thought can really, deeply bring about a way of living that is totally harmonious, non-contradictory, complete in every action. This is very important to find out, because if we want a world that is totally changed, where there is no corruption, a way of living that has significance in itself, we have to ask this question. Not only this but also what sorrow is - and whether sorrow can ever end - what pain, fear, love death is.

We must find out for ourselves the meaning of all this, not according to some book, not what some other person has said. That has no meaning whatsoever. You know knowledge has great meaning, has significance. If you want to go to the moon you must have extraordinary technological knowledge; to do anything efficiently, clearly, you must have a great deal of knowledge. But that very knowledge becomes an impediment when you are trying to find out a way of living that is totally harmonious, because knowledge is of the past. Knowledge is the past and if you live according to the past, obviously there is contradiction, the past in conflict with the present. So one has to be aware of this fact that knowledge is necessary and yet knowledge becomes a great hindrance. Like tradition, it may be useful at a certain level, but

tradition, which responds to the present responsibility, brings about confusion, contradiction. So one has to enquire very, very seriously into the nature of thought.

You know it is only the serious people that live, not the others, because the man who is very serious can apply, can consistently pursue, and not drop it when it suits him, pursue it till the very end till he finds out. He will not be distracted, not be carried away by some enthusiasm or some emotional reaction. That is why a serious man lives fully, and enquires into this question of what is thought, whether there is the possibility of ending sorrow, fear, the meaning of death, and life, and also finds out for himself, not according to anybody else, not according to the speaker - least of all according to the speaker. He finds out for himself a way of living that is harmonious, highly intelligent and sensitive and that has the depth of beauty. And to find out, one has to enquire into the nature of thought.

So what is thinking? Please put yourself this question, what is thinking? We must understand the deep significance of thought because we live by thought. Whatever we do is either reasoned out or examined, investigated or we do it mechanically according to yesterday's pattern, the tradition. So one has to be very clear about what the function of thought is. If you observe very carefully in yourself, don't you find that thought is the response of memory, memory which is experience, which is knowledge? If you had no knowledge, no experience, no memory, there would be no thinking. You would live in a state of amnesia. So thought is the response of memory, and memory is conditioned by the culture in which you have lived, according to your education, according to

the religious propaganda in which you have been caught. So thought is the response of memory with its knowledge and experience - and you need knowledge, you need memory; otherwise you can't get home, otherwise we couldn't speak to each other. But thought, because it is the response of memory, is never free, is always old. You are following all this?

And to find a way of living which is totally harmonious and clear, a way of life that has no distortion, can thought find a way, thought which is the response of the old, which is memory? And yet we use thought to find a way, thought being - if you are objective - rational, clear, sane. We say "I shall think it over and find a way of living harmoniously". And thought is the response of the past, of our conditioning; therefore, thought cannot possibly find a harmonious way of living. You are following all this?

Thought can never find it, and yet we use thought to find it; and yet we know thought is necessary to go home, to earn a livelihood, to do anything; thought at a certain level is absolutely necessary, but thought becomes an impediment to find a way of living which is totally different from the past, which is disharmony.

When you see the truth that thought will not find the way, however reasonable, however logical, however sane or clear, then what is the state of your mind that sees the truth of it? You are following all this? Are you also working as much as the speaker is, or are you merely listening to a few ideas? You understand my question? I hope you are also working as deeply and passionately, otherwise you won't be able to find out, otherwise you will never find out a way of living which is so extraordinarily harmonious and beautiful, and one has to find it in this insane world. So if thought

will not bring about a way of life which is totally harmonious, and if you see the truth of it - not the verbal explanation but the truth of it - what is the quality of the mind, your mind, that has seen this? What is the quality of the mind that sees the truth of something? Don't answer me, please.

You see you are too quick with words and explanations, you don't let it soak into you. You don't stay with it, you immediately jump to words, to explain something or other, and you know very well the explanation isn't the real thing.

So we are asking, what is the quality of the mind that sees the necessity of thought and sees also that thought - do what it will - cannot possibly bring about the beauty of a life that is completely, fully harmonious? You see this is one of the most difficult things to convey or talk about, because we have lived all our lives on somebody else's experiences, we have no direct perception, we are afraid to have direct perception, and when you are faced with this challenge, you are apt to escape, escape into words, explanations - and one has to put aside all explanations. So what is the quality of the mind, that is, what is the nature of the mind that sees the truth? We will leave it there for the moment, because we haven't time to go into too many details, because we have to touch so many things. We are coming back to it.

All of us know what sorrow is, physical pain and psychological grief. All of us know this. If you are a Hindu, you will explain it away through karma, if you are a Christian, you have various forms of rationalization. Please follow all this, not the speaker, but yourself, watch your own sorrow. We are asking whether that sorrow can ever end, and we are going to find out. Either you

explain it away in your own way, according to the particular culture in which you have been brought up, that is, the pain, the sorrow, the sorrow of loneliness, the sorrow of isolation, the sorrow of not achieving something or other, the sorrow of losing somebody whom you think you love - the sorrow not personal, but the sorrow of the world that has lived for so many millennia, that goes on killing, destroying its own species, with man being appalling towards man. When you see all that, the man walking across the park, lonely, with torn clothes, dirty and no happiness - he can never be Prime Minister, he can never enjoy life - when you see all that, there is great sorrow, not for yourself, but that such human beings exist in the world. You understand all this, and that society has brought about such conditions. And then there is the sorrow of one's own loss, neurological pain, and in the face of it, one escapes, one doesn't know what to do. So words, theories, explanations and beliefs act as a way of escape. Have you noticed this? Do please watch it in yourself.

If my son dies, I have a dozen explanations. I escape through my fear of loneliness. So what happens? I go back to sleep again, because sorrow is a way of challenge, asking "Look, what has happened to you, observe." And we don't, we run away. Now, when you remain with sorrow without running away, without escaping, without verbalizing, completely remain with it, without any outward or inward movement, what happens?

Have you ever done this - remained with the sorrow, not resisting, not trying to run away from it, not trifling with it but seeing what has happened? If you remain with it completely, what takes place? When you remain completely with it, without any

movement of thought you recognise the whole structure of what sorrow is; then what takes place? Out of that sorrow comes passion. The meaning of that word "passion" has its root in suffering. You see the connection? If you remain with the fact of anything, specially with the fact of sorrow and don't let thought wander away or explain it away, but you identify yourself with it, completely with it, then there is tremendous energy, and out of that energy there is the flame of passion.

Sorrow brings passion, not lust, and passion you need to find out. So there is an ending of sorrow, which doesn't mean that you become indifferent, callous. There is an ending of sorrow when there is no escape from it and that very sorrow becomes the flame of passion, and passion is compassion. Compassion means passion for all. You can only find out through this flame of sorrow. Then with that intensity, with that passion, one can find out what is the quality of the mind that sees truth. Because then you have passion, you have intensity, you have energy.

Then also you have to find out for yourself whether fear can come to an end, not only fear of physical pain but also the psychological, inward fears that one has. Find the truth of it - not just the verbal explanation. Find out for yourself passionately and therefore seriously to the very end, so that the mind is free from fear. So one has to ask what fear is. Is it the product of thought? Obviously it is the product of thought - that is, you think about something that has given you pain, physical or otherwise, that happened last year or yesterday, you think about it. That very thought sustains and continues that fear. Right? And thought also projects that fear into the future - I may lose my job, I may lose my

position, my prestige, my fame - you follow? Thinking about the past or about the future brings fear. So one asks, can thought come to an end?

And also one can see how thought sustains pleasure: the marvellous sunset, what happened yesterday, that which was so beautiful, so lovely, so exciting, so sensuous, so sexual, and all the rest of it; and you think about it, and thought sustains that pleasure. So there is sorrow, fear, pleasure and joy.

Is joy totally different from pleasure? I do not know if it has happened to you. It happens. Joy comes suddenly. You don't know why, but thought picks it up, thinks about it, reduces it to pleasure and says, "I would like to have that joy again". So thought sustains and nourishes pleasure, fear, and the very avoidance of sorrow is the continuity of sorrow. You see all this? Then there is the fear of death, which is the ultimate fear which man has. We will deal with that presently.

So there it is. Pain, grief, sorrow and whether they can end at all, and fear, not only the superficial fears but the deep unconscious fears that are embedded in the recesses of one's own mind, of which one is not aware. How is one to bring all that out so that one is totally, completely free of all fear?

Now after putting all these questions, what is the quality of the mind that sees the truth of all this, the truth that thought perpetuates pleasure and fear - the truth, not the explanation - the truth that the avoidance of fear through various forms of escape does distort the mind and therefore renders it incapable of comprehending fear totally, completely. What is the quality of the mind that doesn't invite joy, and when the joy happens, it happens

and leaves it alone? So what is the quality of the mind that is aware when thought is necessary, when thought must be employed logically, objectively, sanely, and also sees that thought, which is the response of knowledge, which is the past, becomes a hindrance, blocks a way of living which is non-contradictory? What is the quality of your mind when you say "I understand something"? Your mind is completely empty and silent. You understand? Isn't it? You can only see something very clearly when there is no choice. When there is choice, there is confusion; it is only the confused mind that chooses, that discriminates between the essential and the non-essential, but the man who sees very clearly has no choice. There it is.

So there is an action which comes when the mind is completely empty of any movement of thought except the movement of thought which is necessary when it has to function. Now, can such a mind deal with the everyday facts of life? Which means, can it function if you are a Muslim, a Sikh, a Hindu, a Buddhist, can it ever function when there is conditioning of the mind, which is, can such a mind function through a Hindu who is conditioned according to his background? Obviously not. Therefore, if you see the truth of this, you will not be a Hindu, you will not be a Muslim, Sikh, Christian. You will be something entirely different.

Now do you see the truth of this, and do you cease to be a Hindu, Sikh, Muslim? Not at some future time, but actually at the moment, completely emptied of all the nonsense that goes into this. Otherwise you will never see what truth is. You may talk endlessly about it, read all the books in the world, but you will never come upon the beauty and the vitality and the passion of it. So a mind

that is enquiring, putting fundamental questions, also questions whether society can be radically, fundamentally, changed, not the economic but the psychological structure. Because if the psyche is not changed inwardly, what you produce outwardly will be the same, only modified and continuing in the same pattern.

So one has to ask this fundamental question, and there is nobody to answer except yourself. You cannot possibly rely on any one. Therefore you have to observe, learn to watch, which means, can the mind be completely awake, observant, to see the actual truth of anything because when you see the truth you will act. It is like seeing danger. When you see danger, you act instantly. So in the same way, when you see the truth of something completely, there is complete action.

Question: What happens to the mind after the body disintegrates ?

Krishnamurti: Why do you dissociate the body from the mind? Is there something separate as the mind apart from the body? Psychosomatically, is there a division? Look, Sir, you have been brought up in this country, in this culture, as a Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, or God knows what else. Your conditioning is the result of the society in which you live, which you have created, the society is not different from you. You have created it, your parents have created it, and the rest of the past have created the culture in which you live and you are part of that. Now can you divide yourself from that culture? You can only divide yourself, break away from that culture when you are not of that culture. Right? Isn't that simple? In the same way, why do you divide? I am not going to ask this question, but we will go into it. Why do you divide the body

and the mind? Because you have been told - the Atman, the higher self, the soul - do you know anything about it, or do you repeat what other people have said? How do you know that what others have said is true? It doesn't matter who it is. How do you know? So why do you accept?

So to find out whether the mind is something totally different from the organism, to find out, you have to have a mind that sees very clearly, a mind that has no distortion, a mind that is not confused, a mind that is not conforming. Have you got such a mind, a mind that is not conforming? Which means, when you conform, when you compare, when you compare yourself with somebody, you are conforming. To find out whether you can live without conforming is to find out whether you can live without comparison. Comparing yourself with what you were yesterday or what you will be tomorrow, or comparing yourself with the rich man, the poor man, with the saint, with your hero, the ideal, comparing, which means measuring yourself with somebody or with an idea. Find out what it means to have no comparison. Then you are free, then the mind is completely free of its conditioning.

Question: The fundamental question in philosophy is whether mind and body are separate or not.

Krishnamurti: I have no philosophy.

Question: I want your opinion.

Krishnamurti: I have no opinion.

Question: I want to be enlightened.

Krishnamurti: You are going to be enlightened, Sir, if you listen. Sir, to find the truth of this matter, we must not follow anybody. Philosophy means the love of truth, not the love of

theories, not the love of speculations, not the love beliefs, but the love of truth, and truth isn't yours or mine, and therefore you cannot follow anybody. When once you realize this basic fact that truth cannot be found through another, but you have to have eyes to see it, it may be there with a dead leaf, but you have to see it. And to offer an opinion about it, is ridiculous. Only fools offer opinions.

We are not dealing with opinions, we are concerned with this fact, which is, whether the mind has a quality, has a state or an inwardness which is not touched by the physical. Do you understand my question? Which is the question you are putting me - whether the mind is independent of the body, whether the mind is beyond all the petty, nationalistic, religious limitations? To find that out, you have to be extraordinarily alert and watchful. You have to become aware, sensitive. If you are very sensitive, which means intelligent, you will find out if you go into it very, very deeply, that there is something which is never touched by thought or by the past.

You know thought is matter, thought is the response of memory, memory is in the brain cells themselves, it is matter, and whether the brain cells can be so completely quiet, then only you will find out; but to say that there is or there is not, has no meaning. But to find out, to give your life to this, as you give your life to earning a livelihood - and here, where you need tremendous energy, a great passion to find out, you drink at other people's fountains which are dry. Therefore you have to be a light to yourself, therefore in that there is freedom.

Question: Do you believe in evolution?

Krishnamurti: It is very simple, Sir, I will answer. There is the evolution from the bullock cart to the jet. Going to the moon is evolution.

Probably human beings have reached their height biologically but is there an inward evolution? You are following my question? Will I evolve, become marvellous?

Now before you put that question "Will I evolve?". You have to find out what the "I" is, not say "I will evolve". That has no meaning. But what is the "I"? The "I" is your furniture, your house, the books that you have collected, the memories that you have had, the remembrance of pleasure, pain - the "I" is a bundle of memories. Is there anything more than the "I"? You say the "I" is spiritual, the "I" has a spiritual quality in it. How do you know? Is that an invention of thought? Therefore you have to enquire why thought invents such things. Don't accept a thing, including your own self, because to find truth the mind must be free of the self, not the higher self. The higher self is part of the lower self, that is just another invention of duality. So you have to find out, Sir, if there is evolution.

There is obviously evolution, biologically ; but we are talking psychologically, inwardly, the thing that is continually striving to become and to find out what it is that is becoming.

Question: How can the lower mind find the higher mind?

Krishnamurti: How can the lower mind find the higher mind? Apparently at the end of an hour and a quarter we are still talking about fragmentation, we have talked about the higher self and the lower self which is part of this division. We have talked for about an hour, and still you get up and say, "what is the lower mind and

the higher mind?" Question: I mean there is the parent element....

Krishnamurti: See what the gentleman says. You have translated what you have said into your own Sanskrit terminology, and therefore you are stuck. But you have to say "I know nothing, I want to find out". Don't you want to find out a way of living that is really beautiful, without any pain, without any fear, that is completely harmonious, don't you? And if you do it, Sir, you have to drop all your slogans, what other people have said, you have to find out. This means you have to have tremendous energy ; and you waste your energy by repeating words that have no meaning except for those who have invented them.

Question: What is the relationship between the "me", the "I" and ego, and the mind that sees truth.

Krishnamurti: What is the relationship between the "me", the ego, and a mind that sees, that is empty, that is whole, that perceives truth? What is the relationship between the two? What is the self, the "you"? What is the "you"? When you say "I" - I am a politician, I am a saint, I am this or that, what does that mean? You identify yourself, don't you, with your family, with your furniture, with your book, with your money, with your position, with your prestige, your memories. Isn't the "I" all that? The "I" is also the higher self, the Atman. But the identification with the higher self is still part of thinking, that thought which says there must be something permanent, because life must be permanent. Is there anything permanent?

You are asking what is the relationship between the "I" and that marvellous state of perception that is true. None whatsoever. There is no relationship between the two. The one is the result of conflict,

misery, agony, pain, and the other is empty of all this.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 3

3RD PUBLIC TALK NEW DELHI 17TH

DECEMBER 1970

I think before we go into the rather complex subject of death, we ought to consider what time is, and in relation to time we should also examine what space is, because they are interrelated. No problem, however complex it is, is isolated. Every problem is related to other problems, so we cannot possibly separate one problem, one issue, and discard the others. In understanding it completely, going to the very end of it with reason, logic, sanity, objectivity, we will be able to solve all other problems.

When one considers what is happening in the world and also in this country - the confusion, the deterioration, the corruption, the division, the great suffering - it behoves that all of us should change, should bring about a different world, should create a totally different social structure, not only here in India, but in the world, because we are part of the world. And in seeing the utter chaos, the great confusion and misery, it seems to me, we must not take politics by itself or the economic situation of a particular culture, or separate all this from science, but take the whole movement of life, whether it is in the laboratory or in the field of economics, or in the so-called religious field. It should all be taken as a whole, and that is our problem - not to fragment it, not to divide it, but to take the whole movement of life as a unit and deal with it. And in this movement of life there is time, space, love and death.

We are apt to separate death from life and life from love, as

though it was something apart from time. So to understand what death is one must also understand the question of time and love and that is what we are going to do this evening. We must together examine, understand, communicate, talk it over, share together, which means that you must be equally intense, passionate, try to find out and not depend on the speaker. When we are considering this problem, which is very complex and needs all our attention and naturally our passion - because without passion you cannot possibly understand anything - and as we said, passion comes out of the flame of sorrow, and without understanding the meaning, the depth of sorrow, one will not have the energy, the vitality, the passion to investigate and find out for ourselves what love is and what death is.

We are going first to consider what time is. There is the time by the watch, but is there any other time at all? Time involves process, the gradual becoming, the changing "what is" into what should be. The traditional approach to change involves time, does it not? I am this and I must change to that, or become that - and that involves time, gradualness. And is there such a thing as psychological becoming, psychological evolution at all? Time involves the whole process of thought. Thought is time, and as we pointed out the other day, thought breeds, sustains fear. To understand that extraordinary thing called death, the ending, of which we are so frightened, we must really comprehend for ourselves what time is, why thought has invented time apart from chronological time. Is there a psychological inward becoming, transforming, changing? If you are a part of time, a sequence, a process, then you will have to accept time as a means of achievement. And what then is change,

is psychological change? We are not talking about the biological evolution. As we pointed out earlier, from the bullock cart to the jet plane there is a tremendous evolutionary process, a vast accumulated knowledge, and to accumulate knowledge involves time. Apart from that, is there a process, a gradualness, a continuity of change or is there a psychological revolution in which time does not exist at all? The moment you admit process, gradualness, you will have to have time, as on that all our traditions are based - the practice, the method, the becoming and not becoming. The whole of that structure involves time, promising at the end of it you will have enlightenment, understanding. Can there be understanding through time at all, or is it a perception which is immediate and is therefore immediate change?

Is it possible to break the chain of continuity, the movement from "what is" to what should be? Or is there a total mutation of "what is", not involving time? To find that out one must totally discard all the traditional approach, which is through gradualness, through practice, through sustained effort, because all that involves conflict. Please do understand this very simple factor: where there is conflict there is division, the division between the thinker and the thought, between the observer and the thing he wishes to observe, which is the observed. In that division there must inevitably be conflict because there are other factors involved in it, there are other pressures, other happenings which change what was cause into effect and the effect becomes the cause. Do you follow? So all that involves time.

When you go to your guru - if you have one - he will tell you what to do, which involves time, and you accept it, because you are

so greedy, you want to find something which through time you hope to find. You accept and you are caught in this field of time which is bondage. Now we are investigating this fact that where there is psychological time there is a movement from "what is" to what should be, which involves conflict, and where there is conflict, the mind must be distorted, and a mind that is distorted can never find what is true. That is a simple fact. If I want to see very clearly, I must have an eyesight that is clear, unclouded without any distortion; and there is distortion when there is effort, and effort means time. This is not logic, it may sound logical, reasonable, healthy, sane, but it is not logic; it is direct perception of what is false, because after all the function of the brain is to perceive clearly, to see what is false, and when you see this whole traditional approach of gradual becoming as a process, when you see that it is totally false, then your mind has clarity.

Now, can the mind see directly the falseness of this idea of gradualness, see it, as you see this microphone, see clearly, so that the mind will never touch it at all? That is, in the seeing of the danger of an animal, of a serpent, of a dangerous, savage beast, the very seeing of it is instant action. Do you follow all this?

So perception involves a mind that is not caught in the bondage of time. Do please understand this. Once you understand this fact, your whole structure of thought changes. Perception and understanding do not involve time at all. What is involved is seeing clearly, and to see clearly you must have space, space not only outwardly but inward space. That means space in the mind. You know when a man is chattering, he is filled with knowledge, knowledge being the past, apart from the technological knowledge

which is necessary. When the mind is crowded with the knowledge of the events of yesterday, the pain of yesterday, the various remembrances of yesterday when the mind is crowded, there is no space, and where there is no space, there is conflict.

You know, one of the factors of violence in the world is overpopulation, like in a crowded city when every street is full of people there is no space, and man needs space outwardly. Scientists have made experiments - I have been told by a friend - on rats, on mice. When many of them had been put in a very small space, then they fight each other, the mother destroys the baby, there is complete disorientation. And that is what is happening in the world, that is what is happening in every large town, overcrowded, over-populated ; and one of the factors is this lack of space outwardly. And the other factor is when the mind and the brain also are burdened with so many memories, so many experiences, which is knowledge, there is no space at all.

So you need space so that conflict ends inwardly, and we ask why is there not space at all? Have you ever watched your own mind objectively, looked at it, how restless, chattering, remembering, how crowded and confused it is? How does this happen? Why is the mind never empty, therefore full of space and the beauty of space? You know when you look from a hilltop you see the whole horizon, the vast sky, the beauty of it and the stillness of it. Why has the mind no space at all? You are asking this question, I am not asking you to ask it. You know isolation creates the space. Isolation is a form of resistance, and where there is resistance, there is a limited space. I resist a new idea, a new way of living, I resist any disparagement of tradition, I resist my beliefs.

So within that resistance, within that wall, there is a very small limited space. Have you not noticed it? And this resistance is part of will - "I must do this, I should not do that, I want this." Will is the factor of resistance, and will is part of thought which says there must be an achievement, there must be change, I must become something.

So the factor of not having space is this isolating process of thought as the "me". The activity of thought as the "me" creates a very small space within a very limited area and this small area is time-binding, and because it is a small area it must chatter, it must act, it must move, tremble. Any activity of resistance which is the action of will must limit and isolate the space in which the "me", the "I", the self-centred action is going on. Do you see this? Therefore there is a duality, the "me" and the "not-me", what is beyond the wall of resistance and what is inside the wall which is the "me". And there is the will in the sense of assertion, dominance, ambition to be, the desire for power, position, prestige, which each one wants. Not only the politician, but also you want it, otherwise you wouldn't elect the politician. So if you see that - not intellectually, not verbally or logically - see how the mind is limited, small, enclosed in an action of a very small area, and as long as that area is very limited, there must be conflict, and therefore, there is no space.

So, can there be action without will? Traditionally you are brought up on the action of will - "I must, I must not" - and therefore, the "must" and "must not", the "do" and the "don't" is a form of resistance, and therefore, the action is born of will and therefore limited. Now look at it. You have a habit of smoking, if

you smoke. If you resist it, say "I will not smoke", then there is conflict. Can you drop it, the habit, without any resistance? And you will only drop it if you understand the whole nature and machinery of habit-forming, which we won't go into now. That is not the point involved.

So when there is space in which time does not exist at all, which is time in the sense psychologically, then there is no conflict whatsoever, but out of that space you can act without the action of resistance and will. You see, one must find out a new way of living, a new way of acting, and the old traditional way does not lead to a new action. It is a repetitive action, and to find and to act in a totally different way, one must have this quality of mind in which there is complete freedom of space. So time is thought and time is sorrow.

Now with that understanding let us find out what death is. Or shall we talk first what love is? Because, if you do not know what love is, you do not know what death is. What is love, Sir? Is love pleasure, is love desire, is love associated with sex, what is this thing that we call love? Is it part of hate? In it is there jealousy, anxiety? Can a man who is ambitious, seeking power, position, can he ever know what love is? When you say "I love my family, husband, wife or the girl or the boy", what does it mean? And without finding out for yourself really deeply what that word means, how can you ever find out the meaning and depth of death? Is love a matter of time, something to be cultivated, something to be practised? Do you think it is to be practised, something your guru will tell you what to do, at the end of which will achieve love? Is it the result of thought, time, a process?

And why have human beings throughout the world given such tremendous significance to sex, which they call love? Have you noticed in your own life why sex has become such an all-consuming and important thing, why? Well, Sirs, do answer it.

To find out, you have to ask why your life, the daily living with all its conflict, suffering, the agony, the everyday brutality, why your daily life has become mechanical? Isn't your life very mechanical - going to the office every day, following the tradition every day, establishing certain patterns of activity and going on with them for the rest of your life? God or no God or higher self, lower self - you know all that. You know it would be a marvellous thing if you said to yourself "I will never repeat anything I do not know" that you yourself have not completely understood - not repeat what somebody has said, not the Gita, the Koran, the Bible, or your favourite sacred book. Because that has become a habit, a routine. Do find out what happens if you say to yourself "I will never repeat a word that I have not myself understood, that I have not heard from another."

So when you observe you will see that your life has become extraordinarily mechanical. Do you see that? There is nothing to be ashamed about. It is a fact whether you like it or not, sex is the only thing that you have, which, is free, which soon becomes also a habit; and all this thing you call love, love of God, devotion to your guru, to your idol, the hero, is it love? The truth of that beauty will be found only when you have completely dropped everything that is mechanical.

Have we time to go into this question of death now? We have talked for fifty minutes. Shall we go into it now? What is death of

which we are so dreadfully frightened? What is it? Simply put: coming to an end. I have lived for forty, fifty, twenty, eight years, I have accumulated so much, so many things, so much money, I have indulged in certain activities, ugly and beautiful, I have gathered so much experience, I have cultivated virtue, I have identified myself with my family. And I cry when I leave, not knowing what is going to happen to me. I am afraid of my own loneliness.

And you want to find out if this ends, is there something after, that is, this movement of life, which is not living at all - this endless battle which you call life, living, struggle - and will that continue next life? Or you say to yourself "this is permanent, there is something permanent in me, the Atman, the super-ego, whatever you like to call it, there is something permanent". Please listen to this carefully, because that is part of your tradition, not only here, but right through the world, this tradition that there is a permanent something inside you which will take shape next life. So is there anything permanent? Thought has put all this together, hasn't it, thought saying "I am frightened, I am anxious, I love, I am full of fear, I may lose my job, I want a bigger house, more furniture, more applause, I must have power, position, prestige"? All that is the product of thought, it is created by thought, of everyday activity, the image which thought has put together.

Now is there anything permanent. The moment you think about there being a permanent thing like the Atman - whatever you like to call it - the moment you think about it, it is already the product of thought. And thought is not permanent. Thought is old, it is never free, thought is never new, because thought is the response

of memory and that's all you have - memory, words, the recognition, the association, the identification, that is all you are. Do face it, look at it, you are your furniture, you are your bank account, you are your memories, your pleasures, your hurts, your anxieties, you are all that, and you don't know how to solve it, how to be free of it. Therefore you begin to say there must be some permanent thing which is beyond all this, that must be there. And so thought, thinking about it creates the permanent, the Atman, and what it thinks about, it can produce and thought is of that.

If there is something real, something which is beyond time, time must never touch it. That is, thought can never touch it. So when you state one of your traditions, one of your beliefs - your belief in reincarnation, which is karma, past life, future life, and all the rest of it, if you really believe in reincarnation - it means that you must behave now. You must be righteous now, not tomorrow. You must have rectitude now not next life, which means that you have to pay tremendous attention to what you are doing now. Because if you don't, and yet you believe in that, you are going to pay for it. And it is just a comforting idea - this everlasting talking about what will happen in next life - is there something permanent?' Will I continue in next reincarnation?

So you are not religious, you are just verbalizing in order to have some comfort, because you don't know how to meet death. See all the deceptions, all the hypocrisies you live through because of fear. See the falseness of all your ways, which is time that says "I will believe in next life, I will be good, I will cultivate virtue, I will be less brutal, less violent." All that involves time. You are frightened of this thing called death, the ending of the things that

you have called living - the living which is your anxiety, your fears, your furniture, your petty little things that you have collected as the Hindu, the Sikh, the Muslim, the Christian. That is what you have collected, words, words, because in that you seek shelter and comfort. You do not know how to face this enormous, thing called death, which is the ending of the things known - not something unknown, because one is never frightened of the unknown. You don't know what the unknown is.

What you are really frightened of is the ending of the known. Do look at it, please. It is your life, not the speaker's - your customs, your habits, the traditions, the accumulation of your memories, the so-called love of the family. You really do not love the family, you do not love your children.. If you did love them with your heart and with your brain, then you would have a different kind of education, you would not offer them what you are offering now.

What are you offering for the young generation, what have you to offer them, have you ever considered what you, the older generation, have to offer the younger? Your beliefs? And they watch how hypocritical you are. Your office, going day after day, routine - is that what you are offering to the younger generation? Business, politics, army, your social morality which is utterly immoral, is that what you are offering to them? And any intelligent boy, any student watching all this says "I won't touch it". You understand, Sir?

So what you are frightened of is the ending of your memories - words, the word "God", the word "Atman", words like reality, of which you know absolutely nothing, because you merely repeat

what somebody has written in some book, and you think that book is sacred because people have said it is sacred. But if you say "I will never say a word which I do not know, I will never repeat something which I have not lived", it means the ending of everything that you know - death is that - the ending. When you end, there can be a new thing. When there is a continuity of time as the "me", as "my habits, my agonies, my despairs", which I call living and want that to continue, then there is fear of death. But I know if the mind is aware that it can end the anxiety - not how, there is no "how", then you will know what it means to die every day, so that every day is a new day. The mind then is completely fresh.

So love has no time. It is not to be cultivated; pleasure can be, and that is what you are doing, and the ending of pleasure is your fear. And, therefore, your highest form of pleasure is not only sexual but also the highest is to imagine that there is something, God, to which you are devoted. Do you understand? So to find out the beauty of love and death, you have to die every day to every memory that you have. Try it, do it, die to the memory of your pleasure. Take one pleasure that you have had, drop it instantly. That is what death is going to do. You are not going to argue with death. You cannot say "But leave me some few remembrances, Please". So you can die every day. You will know what the beauty of that thing is, because out of that ending there is a newness, totally, entirely different. But you cannot possibly come upon it unless you know what it means to live without a breath of effort.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 4 4TH PUBLIC TALK NEW DELHI 20TH DECEMBER 1970

We are going to talk over together not merely about religion and the religious mind, but also about reality, meditation, and the quality of the mind that can perceive what is true. The difficulty that is going to take place is that each one of us is going to translate according to his peculiar conditioning, to his particular culture, anything that is being said. To find out, one must discard totally everything that man has put together intellectually, emotionally, and be completely and totally free of all that. One must totally negate all that man has put together in his desire to find reality, and that is going to be our difficulty.

First of all, what is religion? What is the quality of the mind that is asking this question? Religion has played an extremely important part in our lives. Probably it is the foundation of our lives, and without really enquiring into the structure and the nature of a religious mind, merely bringing about a social outward revolution will have very little meaning. You see, to understand the quality of a mind that is religious, one has to first of all enquire into this whole problem of search, seeking, what is implied in search, what is implied in that word, what is the significance that is in the word? Why do we seek at all, and what is it that we are trying to find?

In seeking, there is the seeker and the thing he searches after. There is the entity that is seeking, looking, observing, finding out, and the thing he is going to find out. In that there is duality, the

"me" that is seeking, wanting to find out, and if he can find out, what is it he is going to find? He will find, in his search, according to his conditioning. If you are a Christian, you are going to find what your culture has taught you, the propaganda of your culture; if you are a Hindu what your Hindu culture has taught you, and so on. So according to your culture, according to your conditioning, according to your knowledge, you are going to find that which you call truth, happiness what you will. So the past is going to seek something in the future, and the past is going to dictate what it will find in the future. Therefore, it will not be truth at all. It will be something according to the past, which is knowledge, experience and memory.

So a mind that would perceive what truth is must be free of the past, of its conditioning. That is, if you are a Hindu you must be totally free from all conceptual conditioning or from all your tradition. Otherwise you are going to find what your tradition has dictated, what your tradition has told you to find. So a mind that would perceive what truth is must be free of all its conditioning, of any particular culture, which means, free of any belief. Right? For belief is based on the desire for comfort, for security, or on fear. You don't believe that the sun is going to rise tomorrow. You know it will rise. It is only the mind that is uncertain, confused, seeking security, comfort, that believes. So one must be totally free of all belief, which is, all conclusions, all ideals.

As you are listening, observing this fact, that a mind that is clouded by a belief, which is based on the desire for comfort, security, which is the outcome of fear, such a mind cannot possibly see what truth is, though it may thirst for it. Do you see the truth of

it? If you see the truth of it, then it is finished, your mind is then free to observe. Are you, when you are listening, observing your own belief, your own conclusion? If you would perceive clearly, a mind must be totally free of belief, of your God or my God. As you listen, are you free of it? Or you are so heavily conditioned that without belief you feel lost and therefore frightened and, therefore, attached to your beliefs? Such a mind is obviously an irreligious mind. A mind that is seeking will never find the truth, and all your conditioning is to seek. So can the mind observe the truth that search implies a dualistic conflict and a mind in conflict is always distorted, and therefore it cannot possibly see?

And obviously, a mind caught in rituals is not a religious mind at all. It is after stimuli, sensation, every form of excitement. So can the mind which is really enquiring seriously, passionate to find out, can it put aside totally all rituals, all beliefs, the whole movement of seeking, because we have explained how these things prevent perception?

So are you listening, free of all this division? You are no longer a Hindu at all, are you? I am afraid you are, for the simple reason that you are not serious. You accept life as it is and you don't find the danger of this living, the misery, the confusion, the agony, and so you act mechanically. If you are serious - and you must be serious - life demands it, life is a battle, a misery, a confusion, and if there is to be a different kind of world, one must be very, very serious, and in our so-called search we get caught by so-called gurus. They offer systems, methods, how to reach enlightenment, how to reach something which they call God or whatever it is.

Now, when you have a system, a method, a practice, doesn't it

imply that there is a fixed end? Do these things and you will achieve that. The end is already known and fixed. So there are many, many systems to reach enlightenment, truth, as though truth or whatever you might like to call that, is a fixed state. Once you have achieved, all the troubles are over, and therefore practise, do this and you will get that. Are you following all this?

First of all, will a system lead you to reality? Think it out logically first. System implies a method, a practice, a process. Through a process you will come there. Process implies time. A process implies a mechanical cultivation of habit and therefore constant conflict with "what is" and what should be. Process implies distorting the mind, not understanding the whole structure and the nature of the mind, which is thought. Right? That is, we think through a process, through time, gradually we will arrive at something that is already there, fixed.

Now, is truth something that is permanent, that is there for you to capture, or is it something that is living, therefore, without a path, therefore demanding a constant observation, perception of everything that is happening inwardly, which is non-mechanical? You know, there are many roads to the station, and the station is a permanently fixed thing unless, of course, there is an earthquake or a bomb or something. It is there and the many systems offer a way to get to the station, and people are so gullible, so greedy, that they want the thing which they call truth without enquiring deeply whether there is a static thing as truth.

The religious mind is free from all practice, from all systems, from all organized thought.

One day a man was walking along the street and instead of

looking at the beautiful sky he was watching the pavement as he went along. Then he saw in the distance something very brilliant. He went rapidly towards it, picked it up and looked at this extraordinary thing, and he was in a state of beatitude, because it was extraordinarily beautiful. So he looked at it and put it in his pocket. Behind were two people, also walking. One of them says to the other "What was it that he picked up? Did you see his expression, what an ecstasy he was in by the very act of looking at it?" And the other - who happened to be the devil - said, "What he picked up was truth." And the friend said "That is a very bad business for you that he has found it". He said "Not at all. I am going to help him to organize it."

And that is what we have done - we have the systems, the methods, the practices of the gurus. And so a mind that is enquiring into the nature of truth must be free totally from all organized pursuit, all organized practice, all organized enquiry.

Then there is the question - a religious mind must find out what beauty is, because if there is no beauty, there is no love. And what is beauty? When you perceive what beauty is, then you will know what love is, and the religious mind has this quality of beauty and love. Otherwise it is not a religious mind at all. So what is beauty? You know most religions have denied beauty. The monks, the sannyasis are afraid of beauty. Beauty is associated with sensual desire, and of course if you are seeking reality, God, you must deny all sense of desire, all sense of perception of the beautiful. Therefore you take a vow of various kinds, and when you take a vow, what happens to you? You are everlastingly, inwardly in conflict. Therefore your mind is distorted, neurotic, incapable of

perceiving what is true. So what is beauty? Do ask this question, be passionate to find out, do not sit there just waiting to be told. What is beauty? Is it something in the architecture, in the building, something that is in the museum, something in a book, in the poem, something carved by the hand or by the mind? And does beauty demand expression? Must it be put into words, into a stone, into a building? Or is it something entirely different? And to find that out, to find out what beauty is, and therefore what love is, there must be the understanding of the self, the understanding of oneself, the knowing of oneself, not according to any pattern, not according to any system, but just learning about oneself as one actually is. Do you see it? Wait, let me explain.

One thinks there is a permanent self about which one is going to learn. Right? That is an assumption. Is there a permanent self at all about which you are going to learn, or is the self, the "me" a living thing, constantly changing, constantly moving? To enquire into it is something quite different from learning about something which is there as a living thing. So there must be the understanding of oneself, not according to any system, not according to any philosopher or any analyst, but watching oneself, because where there is this self, there is division from the other self. Right? And where there is division, there must be conflict, and where there is conflict, there is no beauty, and therefore no love.

So a mind that is enquiring into this question of what is a religious mind must be aware, must know the extraordinary state of what beauty is, and it can only see what beauty is when there is total abandonment of the "me", and therefore in that abandonment there is intensity, there is passion, otherwise love does not exist at

all. Love is not pleasure, desire, lust. It is not merely associated with sex. And a religious mind is a mind that knows the movement of virtue and discipline. We are going to enquire into this whole problem of discipline.

You know the word "discipline" means to learn. Please listen to this. If you can listen completely, then you will see the truth of it, and you will see that out of that you have the most extraordinary perception of reality, which does not mean that the speaker is hypnotizing you. The word "discipline" itself means "learn" and not conform, imitate, obey, but to learn; and you cannot possibly learn if you are accumulating.

Accumulation as knowledge is necessary, otherwise you could not possibly go home, you could not do anything. Knowledge is necessary, that is, you acquire through learning a language, a technique; that is necessary if you would be an engineer, a scientist, what you will. That is, one learns Italian or French and there is the accumulation of words, knowledge and speech. That is learning to acquire, and the acquiring is the past which is knowledge. Knowledge is always the past and the knowledge which is the past acts when necessary.

Now there is another kind of learning altogether, which is not acquiring. In learning to observe, there is no acquisition at all; that is, to learn what order is, there should be no accumulation of knowledge, of what order should be, or what order should be according to your particular design. So you are learning about order, not what order should be or a design according to your particular prophet or saint but what order is. Now, how are you going to learn about what order is? Please listen to this. You live in

disorder, that's all you know. You live in contradiction, you live in confusion, you live in this constant battle. This is disorder. Now in observing disorder, in learning all about disorder, there is order, and that is discipline. You get it? You have to observe what disorder is, not to bring order out of disorder, but just to observe what disorder is, negating all positive action, but watching disorder which is what we consider the positive.

So what is disorder? Observe it, observe it within oneself, how disorderly you are, contradictory, pruning this and that, conforming, measuring, comparing, and therefore never free at all. You are confused about everything inwardly, because you no longer trust your guru, you won't ever trust your guru any more, no book, no priest. That means no authority, and when you reject authority altogether, except the authority of the law, when you reject all sense of inward spiritual authority altogether, because the moment you obey, there is no freedom, and a mind must be totally free to enquire. When such a mind rejects authority, it faces its own loneliness, its own despair, its own confusion. This is the disorder in us.

Now, what does a mind which is learning about confusion see? When one is confused, one wants to act, doesn't one? When you are confused, you don't know what to do, and you want to do something. You don't look at that, you don't observe it, you don't study it, you don't learn about it, but you want to "do something about", therefore, you get more and more confused. But you have to watch it, not escape from it.

Why is there confusion? That is, a mind that does not know what to do - which direction to go, whether to become a

communist, socialist, an activist, contemplative, or withdraw altogether from this ugly, beastly world - is confused. Why is there confusion? There is confusion because there is conformity. Conformity implies measurement, measuring myself - what I am with what I should be. Please do follow this. Once you see this, really see the truth of this, confusion is finished. There is confusion, because the mind, through education, through all kinds of circumstances, stresses, strains, through various forms of compulsions and so on, is always measuring itself, what it is with what it should be, the ideal. And that is one reason for this confusion: comparing, conforming, obeying.

Now, why do you conform, why do you measure, why do you obey? You conform because from childhood you have been taught to compare yourselves with another. Watch it, Sir, watch it in yourself, comparing - which means what you are is not important, what you should be is important. Right? So there is a contradiction, the denial of "what is", but the acceptance of what should be, the hero, the image that you have projected from what you are. Now if you do not compare at all, you know what you are, and what you are then is totally different from what, through comparison, you thought you were. You get it? That is, I compare myself with you - you are very clever, bright, intelligent, awake, and comparing with you, I say to myself "I am dull". But if there is no comparison at all, am I dull? I am what I am. I don't call it dull. Then I can do, act, change, go beyond "what is", but if I compare myself with another, I cannot go beyond. You understand? And why do we obey at all? I don't know if you have ever gone into this problem why you obey anybody. You know the word "obey", its root is "to

hear". When you hear over and over and over again that you are a Hindu, a Muslim, a Buddhist, a Christian, a communist, you know what it does? It conditions your mind, doesn't it? You repeat and you instinctly follow, obey. You have been told in this country - and now it is unfortunately spreading in other countries - that you need a guru. That is your tradition, repeated over and over again and you follow what it says. And look what you have done to yourself, what has been done to the mind. A mind that obeys, that conforms, that compares is not a religious mind at all. See the logic of it, see the reason of it first.

You see, Sir, we have to learn what virtue is, which is order. Virtue is order. Virtue is order, not the thing which you practise. You cannot practise humility. When you understand vanity, humility is naturally there. And we have also to go into the question of meditation. What is the meditation of a religious mind? We said the religious mind is free of all belief. It has completely set aside all systems, all authority, all practice. It is in a state of mind that is free of all this which is all part of meditation.

Question: Could we establish a way of understanding each other, a common understanding?

Krishnamurti: You know what is the meaning of that word, not according to the dictionary, what it means "to understand?" When do you understand anything? Is it an intellectual process? Is it an emotional enthusiasm? You understand only when your mind is attentive and completely silent. If I am chattering when you are talking, how can I understand what you are talking about? If I am comparing what you are saying with what I have already read or known or experienced, how can there be communication? I must

listen to you with attention, care, with affection. And out of that care, out of that affection, out of that silence there is understanding, not only verbal understanding but non-verbal. That is the common foundation. And to go into this question of what meditation is, it cannot possibly be done in a few minutes, because this is really an immensely complicated subject, about which we are going to learn, not be instructed by the speaker how to meditate. The moment you put the "how" you are wrong. Never, if I may most respectfully suggest, never ask of anybody the "how". They are all only too eager to give you a method, but if you see the mischief of the "how", that very perception is enough.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 5

5TH PUBLIC TALK NEW DELHI 24TH

DECEMBER 1970

ONE thing is fairly obvious, and that is, we must totally change the way we are living. There must be a deep radical revolution in our lives, a revolution not merely superficial, economic or social, an upsetting of the establishment to put in its place a new one, but we have to be concerned with how the human mind which is so conditioned can undergo a radical transformation, how it can live, act and function at a totally different dimension? Can there be a mutation in the very brain cells themselves? That is one problem and I think that is the major problem, because we are responding to every challenge with the old brain, the old brain which is traditional, habitual, mechanical, which has been conditioned for millennia. Life is a constant challenge to which we are responding with the old brain. The response is mechanical, egoistic, a self-centred response and when we are asking the question whether these brain cells themselves can undergo a radical transformation, a mutation, we have to enquire into the quality of the mind that can perceive without any kind of effort, without any suppression, imitation, conformity.

Now as we said, we are sharing the problem together. There is no authority to tell you what to do, no new system of meditation. When you have a system of meditation, it is no longer meditation. It is just a mechanical repetition, and that is utterly futile and has no meaning whatsoever. Most people, especially in Asia, including this country, have a concept of what meditation is. They have been

told how to meditate, what to do, and all the rest of it. You see, the speaker has not read any books about all this, he has no system; he had to find it out for himself, he had to wipe away everything that he had been told. Nothing must be repeated which he has not himself perceived, which he himself has not lived, never must he repeat in life anything another has said with regard to meditation and with regard to any spiritual matters, never to repeat what he has heard or been told. And if you are going to do the same thing, that is never repeat what you yourself have not perceived, never assert or formulate what others have said about it, then we can communicate together, share together this problem. To find out what truth is, the mind must be totally free of all imitation, conformity, fear, and then only can it see, perceive "what is".

So to understand what meditation is, we must find out what it is not. Because by negating that which is not, that which is false, you find out for yourself what is true. But if you merely accept what others have said - it does not matter who it is, including the speaker - then you are merely conforming, and you are conforming, because you hope through conformity, through obedience, through certain practices, you will experience some fantastic thing, have some vision, great powers, and so on. But if you are serious then we can share together our examination, our investigation to come upon a state of mind, a quality of mind that is utterly free, a mind that is non-mechanical, non-repetitive, a mind that is completely quiet without any form of suppression, without any effort, without any practice.

To find out what is not meditation, first, there must be an understanding or learning about the self, the "me; the "me" with all

its memories, anxieties, fears, ambitions, with its joys, sexual pleasures, the "me" that separates itself from the "you", and the "you" with your "me" that separates itself from another. It must be an understanding of oneself, not according to anybody, not according to any philosopher, any psychologist. And you cannot possibly understand yourself if there is any form of condemnation, any form of justification. To learn about yourself, to see yourself as you are, not as you would like to be, there must be perception.

It is absolutely necessary that one understands oneself, because without that understanding of oneself there is no foundation for enquiry. The understanding of yourself is not the understanding of the self which is permanent, the so-called soul, Atman and the superself. The understanding of yourself means the understanding of your daily life, the way you talk, the motives, the ambitions, the fears, the anxiety, desire for power, position, the various conflicts. That is the "you". You have to understand that because out of that understanding comes righteous action, and without that righteous action, without that true foundation, meditation becomes a self-hypnosis. That is absolutely necessary, not because the speaker says so, but you can see logically why it is necessary that you understand yourself, because if there is any form of contradiction in yourself, any form of fear, any quality of ambition, competitiveness, envy, how can such a mind discover or come upon something that is not of itself? You see, reason, logic tells you that you must understand yourself first and not escape from yourself. You must know yourself, and therein lies one of our difficulties, which is, when one is learning about oneself, observing one's thoughts, not controlling them, not suppressing them, the

question arises as to who is the observer?

If we are going into this question of meditation and the question of how to live without sorrow, without conflict, how to live a life that is abundant, rich, that has meaning in itself, you have to understand this question, which is : who is the observer that is learning? I am watching myself - I am watching my speech, the way I talk, my gestures, my brutality, my violence, my kindness - this whole battle of existence, I am watching. Now is the watcher different from the thing he is watching? That is, the watcher who says, "I am learning about myself", is he different, an outsider, watching what is happening? You understand the question? Is the watcher different from the thing he watches, or are they both the same? Is the watcher, the censor, the person who says, "I am watching myself", is that entity different from the thing he watches, or is the observer the observed?

You will find, as you watch, the observer is the observed, the two are not separate; therefore, there is no sense of contradiction; therefore there is no sense of suppression, control. Both are one. Again this is reasonable, logical. You do not have to accept this from anybody, you can see this for yourself. There is no higher self watching the lower self. When you examine this whole observation in which there is learning, you will find the observer is the observed. The man who is angry is anger itself, the entity that says there is a soul, there is Atman, there is a superself, is part of thought. So what is important is to learn about oneself without the censor. When you, the censor says, "Do this, don't do that, this is wrong, that is not wrong", then you are watching. It is your previous conditioning, your tradition, your previous memory

interfering with observation. Do you see this simple fact? And you have to learn about yourself; otherwise you have no basis whatsoever for clear perception.

Then out of this arises the question of discipline. From what people have said, it is asserted that you must discipline yourself, control yourself, hold yourself. You know that is what we are trained to do from childhood, from the books that you read and so on that you must control, discipline, shape yourself according to a pattern. Now "discipline" means to learn, the word itself means to learn not to conform, not to obey. The very act of learning is discipline. If I am to learn about myself without the observer, then that very observation brings its own order. After all, order is necessary and that has been translated into discipline. So order is necessary and this order cannot be brought about by any form of compulsion, by following a pattern. Order can only come about when you have observed what is disorder. That is, you live in disorder, your life is in disorder, your life is in contradiction, messy, confused.

Now, by learning about yourself you bring about order. Therefore you have to find for yourself how to observe yourself, observe without the observer, the observer being the entity that condemns, that judges, that evaluates, that denies; he is the censor which is the past. So you have to observe without the past. That is, when you look at a rose, you have to look at it without the image that you have about it, or the word that you have which is "the rose". That prevents you from looking at the rose. Can you observe without the word?

Then, what is meditation? What is the quality of the mind that is

in a state of meditation? We are going to share together; that does not mean we are going to meditate together, which is again sheer nonsense. First of all, you have to understand this question. Just listen, without judging, agreeing or disagreeing, without wishing to understand what is being said, just give your attention completely to what is said. If you give your attention completely to what is going to be said, that very state of attention is meditation. You understand? We will go into it. Just listen. The speaker is not mesmerizing you, the speaker is not telling you what to do, the speaker is trying to point out certain facts, not according to his opinion, his judgement, facts which you and the speaker can discover, not at some future date, but now, by using your reason, logic,

You know it is one of the most difficult things to put into words, because you see one has to understand the nature and the structure of thought. That is part of meditation. Understand it, because if you don't understand what thought is, then you are constantly in conflict with thought. I really do not know where to begin this whole business, because it is a very complex thing which we are going to look into together. You see, whether you understand or not what the speaker is going to say, just listen.

The first step is the last step. The first step is the step of clear perception, and that act of clear perception is the last act. When you see danger, a serpent, that very perception is the complete action. Do you follow? Now we said the first step is the last step. The first step is to perceive, perceive what you are thinking, perceive your ambition, perceive your anxiety, your loneliness, your despair, this extraordinary sense of sorrow, perceive it,

without any condemnation, justification, without wishing it to be different. Just to perceive it, as it is. When you perceive it as it is, then there is a totally different kind of action taking place, and that action is the final action. Right? That is, when you perceive something as being false or as being true, that perception is the final action, which is the final step. Right? Now listen to it. I perceive the falseness of following somebody else, somebody else's instruction - Krishna, Buddha, Christ, it does not matter who it is. I see there is the perception or the truth that following somebody is utterly false. Right? Because your reason, your logic and everything points out how absurd it is to follow somebody. Now that perception is the final step, and when you have perceived, you leave it, forget it, because the next minute you have to perceive anew, which is again the final step. If you do not drop what you have learnt, what you have perceived, then there is a continuity of the movement of thought; and the movement and continuity of thought is time. And when the mind is caught in the movement of time, it is in bondage.

So that is one of the major problems, whether the mind can be free of the past, the past regrets, the past pleasures, the memories, remembrances, incidents and experiences, all the things that one has built up, the past, which is also the "me". The "me" is the past. Now, thought gives continuity to something which has been perceived clearly, and not being able to put it aside gives it a continuity which becomes the means of perpetuating thought.

You had a happy incident yesterday. You don't forget it, you do not drop it, you take it over with you, you think about it. The very thinking about something which is of the past gives continuity to

the past. Therefore there is no ending to the past. You are following all this? But if you perceive that you had a most extraordinary, happy incident yesterday, see it, perceive it, and completely end it, do not carry it over, then there is no continuity as the past which thought has built. Therefore every step is the last step. Do you get it?

So we have to go into this question whether thought which is giving a continuity to memory as memory - and memory is the past - whether thought can ever come to an end. Because that is part of meditation. It is part of a total mutation of the brain cells themselves, because if there is a continuity of the movement of thought, it is the repetition of the old, because thought is memory, thought is the response of memory, thought is experience, thought is knowledge.

So our question is: thought is always perpetuating itself through experience, through the constant repetition of certain memories. Knowledge is always in the past, and when you act according to knowledge, you are giving continuity to thought, but you must have knowledge to act technologically. See the difficulty. If you did not use thought, you could not go home, you could not work in an office. You must have knowledge, but also see the importance, the danger of a mind that is caught in the perpetual movement of thought, and therefore never seeing anything new. Thought is always old, thought is always conditioned, never free, because it is acting according to the past. So the question is, how can this movement of thought which at one level is absolutely necessary to function logically, sanely, healthily, how can this movement of thought come to an end, for a man to perceive something totally

new, to live totally differently?

The traditional approach to this question is control it, hold it, or learn to concentrate. Right? Which again is absurd because who is the controller? Is not the controller part of the thought, part of the knowledge which says you must control? That is, you have been taught to control. So there is a way of observing thought without any control, without giving it a continuity, but observing so that it ends. You have understood my question? Because if thought continues, the mind is never quiet, and it is only when the mind is completely quiet, that there is the possibility of perception. See the logic of it, that is, if my mind is chattering, comparing, judging, saying this is right, this is wrong, I am not listening to you. To listen to you, to understand what you are saying, I must give my attention, and to give one's attention completely, that attention itself is silence. Right?

One sees very clearly that silence is completely necessary, not only at the superficial level, but at the most deep level, at the very root of our being there must be complete silence. How is this to happen? It cannot possibly happen if there is any form of control, because then there is conflict, because then there is the man who says, "I must control", and there is the thing to be controlled. In that there is division, in that division there is conflict. Therefore, is it possible for the mind to be completely empty and quiet, not continuously but each second? That is the first perception, that the mind must be completely quiet, the perception, the truth of it and the seeing of the truth of it is the first and last step, and then that perception must be ended; otherwise you carry it over. Therefore the mind must observe, must be aware choicelessly of every

perception and there must be the ending of that perception instantly, seeing and ending. You are following all this? So the mind is not living with thought which is the response of the past and giving to that thought a continuity into the future which may be the next minute, the next second. And thought is the response of memory which is the very structure of the brain cells themselves. If you have observed yourself, you will see that in the brain cells themselves is the material of memory, and that memory responds, which is thought. To bring about a total mutation in the quality of the cell itself, there must be an ending of every perception, understanding, seeing, acting and moving away from it, so that the mind is always perceiving and dying, perceiving the falsity of the truth and ending it and moving on without carrying the memory. Right?

You know all this demands tremendous perception, tremendous vitality, energy. To go into this step by step as we have been doing, not missing a thing, requires tremendous energy. Now let us find how this energy comes into being. You understand my question: We need energy. For you to come here and sit here for a whole hour and listen, demands energy. To do anything requires energy, and this energy can be dissipated, used in all kinds of ways. So the question is, can this ordinary everyday energy - going to the office, quarrelling, nagging, fighting, sexual - can this energy be heightened, can this energy be completely held without any form of distortion?

You see, our energy is dissipated in conflict, conflict between two nations, conflict between two opinions, conflict between the husband and the wife and the children, conflict between trying to

see God and suppressing all your instincts. That is also conflict, that is distortion. How does one have this complete energy without distortion? Now let us find out, by investigating what is distraction, dissipation of energy. We said conflict in every form is a dissipation of energy - conflict between the observer and the observed, between the ideal and the fact, between the "what is" and 'what should be'. Conforming to what has been and trying to carry out what has been in the present or in the future, that is part of conflict. So that is a distortion of energy, every form of conflict dissipates energy. Right? And the religious people throughout the world, the monks; the sannyasis, the yogis, and the rest of them, they all say "you must control, you must be celibate, you must take a vow of poverty." What does that imply? - Conflict, more and more conflict, suppression, conformity, and you think through conformity, suppression, every form of battle with yourself or with another politically, religiously or theoretically, you will have some kind of tremendous experience.

So when you see the truth, when you perceive the truth that every form of conflict is a distortion, that very perception is the ending of conflict at that moment; then forget it, begin again. Do not say "I have seen it once and I am going to hold on." You follow? That means you give continuity to thought, which is memory - of what you perceived a few minutes ago - and so strengthen the brain cells to carry on with this memory of the past and therefore there is no radical change in the structure of the memory, in the structure of the brain cells.

And there is this question of seeking experience. They all say you must experience something fantastic, something

transcendental. Now first of all, why do you want to experience something beyond the ordinary? Why do you want to experience something extraordinary? Because for a very simple reason you are tired of your daily experiences, you are bored: the daily experience of sex or no sex, the daily experience of anger and so on. You are bored with all that, and you say, "By jove, there must be some other kind of experience." Now that very word "experience" means "to go through", finish with it, not carry it over. Right? And who is it that is seeking experience - the entity that says, "I am tired of all these superficial things and I want something more?" That entity is part of the desire to have more and that entity projects what it wants. You being a Hindu, a Muslim or a Christian, or God knows what else, you being conditioned, you want to experience Christ or Buddha or Krishna or whatever it is; and you will, because what you are going to experience, is projected from your past, because you are conditioned as a Hindu. So your nirvana, your heaven, your experience, your future is according to your ugly little past.

And a mind that seeks experience, that wants more has not understood totally "what is", which is the "me" that is craving for all this. A mind that seeks experience is bound to time, is bound to sorrow; for thought is time, for time is sorrow. Now can the mind be totally awake without any question of challenge, experience? Because, most of us need to be challenged, otherwise we will go to sleep. Right? If you are not challenged every day, questioned, criticized, you will naturally go off to sleep. So can the mind keep so totally awake that it needs no experience at all? You follow? And that can only happen when the mind has understood the whole structure and the nature of thought. There are so many things to

talk about in this.

The traditional people say, "Sit straight, breathe this way and that way, stand on your head for twenty minutes." What does it all mean? You can sit in the right posture, with your back straight, breathing correctly - pranayama and all the rest of it - for the next ten thousand years, and you will be nowhere near perceiving what truth is, because you have not understood yourself at all, the way you think, the way you live, you have not ended your sorrow; and yet you want to find enlightenment. So one has to drop all that.

You know there are powers, siddhis, as they are called, that seem to entice people. If you can levitate, if you can read thought, if you can do all kinds of twists and turns with your body, it seems to fascinate people, because that way you get some power and prestige. Now all these powers are like candles in the sun. They are like candlelight when the brilliant sun is shining. Therefore, they are utterly valueless. They have a therapeutic physical value, nothing else.

How does a mind without following any system, without following any compulsion, without any comparison, how can a mind which has been so long conditioned, be completely empty of the past? You understand my question? To empty completely so that it sees clearly, and what it is seeing clearly end it, so that it is always renewing itself in emptiness, that is, renewing itself in innocence.

Now the word "innocence" means an innocent mind, means a mind that can never be hurt. The word "innocence" comes from a Latin word which means incapable of being hurt, and most of us are hurt, hurt with all the memories which we have accumulated

round those hurts, our remorse, our longings, our loneliness. Our fears are part of this sense of being hurt. From childhood we are hurt consciously or unconsciously. How to empty all that hurt, not taking time, you understand, not saying "Gradually I will get rid of this hurt?" When you do that, you will never end it, you are dead by the end of it. So the question is whether the mind can empty itself completely, not only at the superficial level, but also at the very depth of its being, at its very roots. Because otherwise one lives in a prison, one lives in the prison of cause and effect in this world of change.

So you must ask this question, put this question to yourself, whether your mind can be empty of all its past and yet retain the technological knowledge, your engineering knowledge, your linguistic knowledge, the memory of all that, and yet function from a mind that is completely empty. The emptying of that mind comes about naturally, sweetly without bidding, when you understand yourself, when you understand what you are. What you are is the memory, bundle of memories, experiences, thoughts. When you understand that, look at it, observe it; and when you observe it, see in that observation that there is no duality between the observer and the observed; then when you see that, you will see that your mind can be completely empty, attentive, and in that attention you can act wholly, without any fragmentation. All that is part of meditation - not just sitting in a corner for five minutes a day and going off to some idiotic conflict with yourself, not twisting your head or your breathing - these are all too infantile. They are exactly like candlelight in the sun.

And the next question is whether you understand totally the

whole fragmentation of yourself - not integration - understand how this fragmentation and its contradiction arise, not how to bring it together. You cannot do that. To bring it together implies a duality - the one who is bringing it, bringing about integration and all that. Then when you really, deeply, profoundly understand about yourself, learn about yourself, then you can understand the meaning of time, the time that binds, holds, that brings sorrow.

If you have gone that far, and that means you have not gone far in the distance, far verbally, not measurably far, if you have gone that far, not in height or depth, if you have gone to that height of understanding, with that fullness, then you will find out for yourself a dimension which has no description, which has no word, which is not something to be bought through sacrifice, which is not in any book, which no guru can ever experience. He wants to teach you about it, how to reach it, therefore, when he says, "I have experienced that and I know what that is", he has not experienced it, he does not know what it is. The man who says he knows does not know. So a mind must be free of the word, the image, the past, and that is the first step and the last step,

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 6

1ST PUBLIC TALK MADRAS 6TH JANUARY

1971

FIRST of all, I would like to say how important it is to find out for oneself what learning is. It is quite an art, because most of us have our own opinions, conclusions, points of view, dogmatic beliefs and assertions; we have our own peculiar little experiences, our knowledge which will obviously prevent us from actually listening to each other, because all these opinions and judgements, all this information will crowd in and hinder the act of listening.

Can one listen without any conclusion, without any comparison and judgement, just listen, as you would listen to music, to something which you really feel that you love? Then you not only listen with your mind, your intellect, but also you listen with your heart, listen with care, objectively, sanely, listen with attention to find out. You know what you think, you have your own experiences, your own conclusion, your own knowledge. For the moment at least put them aside. Otherwise we cannot investigate, learn together; and we are going to learn together, because, after all, the word "communication" means to have something in common with which we can co-operate, think over together, share together, create together, understand together, not the speaker explaining and you merely listening. Together we must understand this whole question of what truth is, what living is, this complex problem of daily activity, of what is actually going on, both outwardly in the world and inwardly.

To investigate and learn together implies that there is no

authority. When you perceive what actually is, then you can do something about it, but if you observe "what is" with a series of conclusions, a series of opinions, judgements, formula, you will never understand "what is". If you observe the world as a Hindu or as a Muslim or as a Christian, then obviously you cannot see clearly; and we have to see together, very clearly, objectively, sanely. So, if one can observe very clearly - which in itself is a form of discipline - what is happening inwardly and what is happening outwardly, one can see that this is a unitary movement, not a separate movement.

What is actually happening outwardly, not only in this country, but all over the world? This is a simple, obvious fact: sociologically, economically, culturally, there is disintegration. Politicians have not been able to solve any problem. On the contrary, they are increasing them. Countries are divided as affluent societies and the so-called undeveloped countries. There is poverty, war, conflict of every kind. There is no morality. That is gone too. All the religious organizations with their beliefs, with their rituals, with their dogmas, are really separating people. If you are a Hindu and I am a Muslim we must be against each other. We may tolerate each other for a few days outwardly, but basically, inwardly, we are against each other. So while there is division, there must be conflict, not only outwardly but inwardly.

So our problem is, can all this be radically changed? Can there be an inward and therefore an outward, psychological revolution? We cannot possibly go on with our old habits, with our old traditions, with our old ways of thinking. Our very structure of thought must change, our very brain cells themselves must undergo

a transformation to bring about order, not only within ourselves but inwardly.

The mind has been put together through time. The brain cells which have evolved through millennia, through centuries upon centuries, put together, have acquired tremendous knowledge, experience, have collected a great deal of scientific, objective knowledge. These brain cells which are the result of time have produced this monstrous world, this world of war, injustice, poverty, the appalling misery that is going on in the world, the division of people, racially, culturally, religiously: and all this has been produced by the intellect, by thought; and any reconstruction by thought is still within the same field.

First of all, thought has produced this division among people for economic, social and cultural reasons, both linguistically and ideologically. Do follow this. If you observe, you will see for yourself very clearly that the intellect, with all its cunning reason, both objective and non-objective, that thought has brought about this condition, this state, both inwardly and outwardly. You are conditioned by the past, and you think along these lines - and that very same thought tries to find a way out of this confusion; and that confusion has been created by thought. This is not what I say, what the speaker says, it is what you have discovered for yourselves.

Are you listening with passion to find out? We have got to change. We cannot go on as we are, lazily, satisfied with little things, accepting certain doctrines as truths, believing in something about which we know absolutely nothing, following somebody, hoping that he will lead us to enlightenment. All this has been

produced by thought; and thought is the response of memory. If you had no memory, you could not think. Memory is knowledge, memory is gathered experience, and thought is the response of the past. And we are trying to solve an immense, complex problem of human relationship in terms of the past, which is thought. Do you get this?

So the question is how can thought, which has brought about this culture, whether the Hindu, Christian, communist, or what you will - and that thought which is the response of memory, which is knowledge, and that thought which has created such confusion, misery, sorrow in the world - how can thought, the very brain cells which contain the memory, undergo a radical mutation?

Knowledge is necessary, otherwise you cannot go home, otherwise you could not write a letter. Scientific knowledge, technological knowledge, is absolutely necessary for us to function. One must have knowledge, which is the accumulation and the product of thought. So there is a contradiction in the very functioning of thought. On the one side it divides, separates, psychologically as well as outwardly, and on the other, thought has gathered extraordinary knowledge, created knowledge.

So the question is, can thought, though it must function within the field of knowledge, can that very thought cease to create separation? Basically, fundamentally, that is the problem. Thought is old, because memory is of yesterday. Thought is never free, because it can only function within the field of knowledge. This thought is the response of memory, and that memory is within the very structure of the brain cells.

Now is there a perception in which the very seeing is the

acting?

Have you understood my question? You see, you are not used to investigating, you are not used to observing yourself, you are accustomed to reading what other people say and repeating whether it be Sankara, Buddha, whoever it is. You know it would be marvellous if you never said a word that was not your own discovery. Never say anything that you yourself do not know, which means, you will put away all your gurus, your sacred books, religious books, theories, what the philosophers have said, though of course you will have to keep your scientific, technological books. Never say anything that you do not understand, that you have not discovered yourself. And you will see then the whole activity of the mind undergoes a tremendous change. Now we are secondhand human beings and we are trying to find out a way of living which is really timeless, because thought is time, because time is putting things together - a process - and process implies time.

To get from here to there requires time, because you have to cover space. Thought thinks in terms of time, thinks of life as a process - getting from here to there. Now we are enquiring whether there is a way of living in which time does not exist at all. What we are concerned with is change, a revolution, a total mutation of the very structure of the brain cells; otherwise you cannot produce a new culture, a new way of living, a living in a different dimension altogether. So is there an action of perception in which thought does not enter except technologically?

Look, one has lived in the same old pattern, in a corner of this vast field of life, in a small corner, and in that corner there is

extraordinary division, that very corner creates division, and we are living in that state. One observes this, not through books, not through newspapers, not through what somebody else says. One actually observes this fact and one asks if this can be radically changed. We think of change in terms of time - "I will be different tomorrow." We are caught in the verb "to be" - "I have been" "I am", "I shall be" - caught in the trap of that word "to be". The word "to be" is time. Time does not seem to bring about radical change. "I will be tomorrow what I have been" - modified, slightly different - but it is the same movement of what has been and that is a process in time, and in that there is no mutation, there is no transformation, and how is this mutation to take place from which there will be a different way of living, a different culture, a different creation altogether? That is the question, you understand - to perceive and act, not perception and later on action.

I see in myself a great deal of suffering, a great deal of confusion, ambition, anger, brutality, violence. All the things that man has put together are in me, are in you - the sexual pleasures, the ideological pleasures, the fears, the agonies, the competitive drive, aggression - that is what we are. Can that be changed instantly? We think we know a way of bringing about a radical change in that through time - gradually I will evolve, gradually I will get rid of my anger and all the rest of it - that means time. And one sees time does not change at all. It may modify but radically it does not change, because you perceive yourself as you are and you say "I will be that, I should be that". In that interval between what you are - what is - and what should be, is space, is time; and when you are moving from "what is" to what should be, there are other

factors coming in and therefore you will never come to what you should be.

I am violent and I say to myself, "I must not be violent." The "must not be violent" implies time, and between now and next week I am sowing the seeds of violence. Therefore I have not stopped being violent. Therefore I ask myself, is there a way, is there a perception which is free from time and therefore involves instant action? Is there a perception of violence which will end that violence instantly? I want to see if violence can end instantly and not gradually, because when you say "gradually", it will never end. Do you see that?

Therefore, is it possible to perceive with a perception that is itself action? Shall we go on from there? Now what prevents this perception? To perceive - perception as action - as when you see a snake you act instantly. There is no saying, "I will act next week". There is immediate response, because there is danger. Now what prevents the mind, and therefore the brain, from this instant action of perception?

What do you think prevents it? Why do you not see that time is a barrier, time does not bring freedom because time as thought is putting things horizontally and vertically together; and that time will not bring about a different perception of life in a different dimension? So what is it that prevents perception? Why do you not see things clearly and act instantly? Why do you not see this division, the psychological division of you as a Parsee, a Hindu, a communist, a socialist, a Muslim? That division creates tremendous conflict - do you see that? How do you see it, verbally, or as an actual fact of danger? Do you see that as long as you are a

Hindu, a communist, the very fact must bring about division, and division is conflict. Intellectually, I recognise it, I say "Yes, that is so." And there I stop. But action does not come from it. I do not completely cease to be a Hindu, which means all the tradition, all the conditioning, the culture; that does not cease, because I am intellectually hearing the words without relating the words to perception.

Why is there no perception of the sort there is in danger when you perceive and act instantly? Because you say you know what is happening in the world - black against white, communist against capitalist, labour against somebody, the Catholic against the Protestant, though both worship what they call Jesus Christ, and so on.

Here too there is division, linguistic, national, cultural. You have your guru and I have my little guru, I have my guru's system, my system to Nirvana, to heaven, and you have yours. So there is division, there is conflict, and out of this conflict there is war, both inwardly and outwardly. A man who is really serious, who wants to find a way of living where there is no conflict at all at the very root of his being, has to find out not merely intellectually, not verbally, but actually find out for himself if there is an action which is not of time. Now I will go into it.

Now we begin at the very objective level, whether you can see anything, to see a tree without the image, without the knowledge, without thought coming in between the observer and the observed and saying, "That is a mango tree". Have you ever done it? You have always observed, through an image, haven't you?

Now you must see without verbalization. The verbalization is

the process of thinking. Can you observe a tree, your neighbour, your wife or your boy or girl friend without the image, can you? You can't, can you? Can you observe your wife, which is a little more difficult than observing a tree?

You can observe a tree fairly easily without the image, without the word, without thought. When you observe the tree without the whole mechanism of thought coming into operation, then the space between you and the tree which is time - disappears. This does not mean that you become the tree or you identify yourself with the tree. You see the tree completely, not partially. There is only the tree without the observer. You understand this? You have never done it. Do it, not try to do it, do it. That is, observe a flower, the cloud, the bird, the light on the water, the movement of the breeze among the leaves, just watch it, without any image. Then you will see there is a relationship which has never existed before between what is observed and the observer, because then the observer comes totally to an end.

Now observe your wife or your friend without the image. Do it. You have the image of your wife, haven't you? - or the husband or somebody? That image has been built through time. You have lived with her sexually, she has nagged you, you have bullied her - you know all these things that happen in family life. You have built up through years images about her and she about you; and you look at each other through those images, don't you? Now that image separates people, the image of you as a Hindu and a Muslim. That image prevents, divides, and if I have an image about my wife, the image that she has and the one that I have obviously must divide.

Now, how is this image to come to an end, the image as a

Hindu, as a Muslim, as a communist, as a socialist, the image that one has built about oneself and the image that one has built about another? If that image disappears, then there is a totally different kind of relationship. This is because the image is the past, the image is the memory, the memory is the various markings on the brain cells which have taken place through a number of years - such as the conditioning of the brain cells as a Hindu - and that image remains. Now the question is, can that image come to an end, not through time, not gradually but instantly? To answer that question, one has to go into what the machinery is that builds images.

Are you also working, or are you merely learning from the speaker? Don't learn from the speaker, because the speaker has nothing to teach you. He has absolutely nothing to teach you, because he does not accept the teacher-disciple relationship because that breeds authority; and where there is authority there is division - the one who knows and the one who does not know. And the man who says he knows, does not know. So you are not learning from me, from the speaker. You are learning by observing yourself, by watching. Therefore you are free to learn. Therefore freedom is absolutely necessary to learning.

So learn from observing; and you are observing yourself, you are observing that you have your own image about another, that you have an image of yourself as a Hindu, as a Buddhist, communist, Christian, Protestant, as a hippy, and so on and on. You see that image in yourself. Now you say to yourself, "I know how that image has come into being, because I have been brought up as a Christian, as a Hindu, as a Muslim. I am born there, I am

conditioned, and that image remains and that image divides people." Where there is division there must be conflict, outwardly and inwardly. Then you are learning from your own observation; you are asking yourself, "Can this image come to an end?" When you ask that question, you are also asking the question, "What is the machinery that builds this image?"

Now what is the machinery that puts together this image? Just observe it, don't try to translate it and act upon it; just observe what the speaker is saying, listen to it, and observe the action of perception on yourself. You tell me I am a fool. The word with its associations has set in operation memory in the brain cells. The word "fool" has its associations, which is the memory, which is the old brain. The old brain says, "You are another; you call me a fool and I call you another". So the response is the response of the old memory. Now the machinery operates as you observe when the wife or husband nags, when at the moment of nagging there is no attention. When there is attention at the moment of nagging there is no operation of the machine.

Do you see this? You call me an idiot. If I am completely aware at that moment, then the machinery has no fuel to act. Right?

At the moment of inattention, when there is no attention, then the machinery is in operation. You can see this yourself. At the moment of attention, you can say what you like. The machinery does not function. At the moment when you are completely aware, and you call yourself a Hindu, you see all the significance, all the meaning - division, conflict, battle, separation. That perception takes place only when you are completely attentive. At that moment the machinery of Hinduism, which is the conditioning,

comes to an end.

Then the next question arises, how can this mind keep so attentive all the time? Is that the question you are asking? You see, at the moment of attention all the conditioning disappears, all the image-building comes to an end; it is only when you are not attentive that the whole thing begins - you are a Hindu, Muslim, Christian, communist. And then the next question is, can this attention be sustained, which means, can this attention continue? Please follow this. Can this attention continue all the time, which means, can this attention endure? That involves time, does it not?

You are putting a wrong question, when you say, "Can this attention endure, can I keep this attention all the time, what is the system what is the method to sustain this attention?" The moment you ask, "How is it to continue?", you are inviting time, therefore time is inattention. When you are completely attentive, there is no time, and when there is this attention and you have perceived and acted, it is over. Do not say "I must carry it with me".

Do you understand, do you follow this? That is, at the moment of attention you have seen and acted - perception, action - but thought says, "How extraordinary: I wish I could continue that attention all the time, as I see in it a way of acting without all this conflict". And so thought wants to cultivate attention. Any form of cultivation implies time. So attention cannot be cultivated through time. Therefore, perception, action and end there, forget it, begin again, so that the mind, the brain cells, are fresh each time, not burdened with yesterday's perception. Have you got it?

So the mind then is always fresh and young and innocent, not carrying all the burdens of yesterday, and the word "innocence"

means a mind that can never be hurt. A mind that has no markings of ever being hurt, that is real innocence. And most of us are hurt from childhood, we are beaten, we are crippled, we are tortured, we have scars on the brain, and we are struggling through these scars to find some state of mind in which there is no hurt. An innocent mind is a mind that has never been hurt, that means a mind that never carries the hurt over to the next day. So there is neither forgiveness, nor remembrance.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 7 2ND PUBLIC TALK MADRAS 10TH JANUARY 1971

THIS evening I think we ought to go into many problems, such as the importance for a human being to change himself when the environment, the society, the culture is so corrupt, so disintegrating. One sees the necessity of changing the environment - the environment being the society, the religion, the culture and so on - and what importance that has when the whole social structure, the community, the world about us, when that cannot be changed by an individual, by one human being. What significance has one individual, one human being transforming himself when around him there is so much chaos, so much misery, such confusion, such madness?

I think that question is wrong because the human being is the result of the culture in which he lives. He has built the culture, the society, the environment, and in changing himself is changing the environment. He is the world and the world around him is himself. There is no division between himself and the world. I think one must clearly understand, right from the beginning, that there is no division, as between the individual and the community. The word "individual" means an entity who in himself is indivisible. Most human beings are divisible, are fragmented, which is partly the result of society, and the culture in which they live.

So I think it is important that we understand this fact that human beings are the result of the environment in which they live. You are born in this country, you are a Hindu or a Muslim, this or that. If

you are born abroad in the West, you are a Christian, a Catholic, Protestant, and all the divisions of Catholicism or Protestantism. Now one may logically, intellectually accept this as an idea, as something which appeals to reason, but there it stops, because we seem to be incapable of really putting that fact into action. And we are going, if we can this evening, not only to discuss the conflict in man and therefore in the world, the conflict within himself and in his relationship with the world, the conflict between the various factors of fragmentation - each fragment in opposition to the other fragment of which the human being is made up - but also whether it is possible for the human mind to be totally free from all conflict, because then only is it possible to know what it means to love and also then perhaps we shall comprehend the full meaning of death and what living is. So first it is necessary that we should understand what conflict does to the human mind.

Human beings right throughout the world, are in conflict and themselves, with their neighbours, with the world, with the environment of which they are part. And until we understand this problem and find out for ourselves whether there is a possibility of completely ending conflict - totally - we shall never be able to live at peace with ourselves and also with society.

It is only a mind that is completely peaceful, not asleep, which does not mesmerize itself into a state of what it considers peace but which actually lives at peace, it is only such a mind that can find what truth is, what it means to live, what it means to die, what is the depth and width of love.

We are going first to enquire together why man lives in conflict, why you live in conflict. I do not know if you are aware of it, first

within yourself, how you are fragmented, broken up. You are a businessman and house-holder. You are an artist and at the same time as a human being you are greedy, envious, seeking power, prestige, fame. You are a scientist and an ordinary, rather shoddy little human being. As human beings we are fragmented, broken up in ourselves, and unless you are aware that you are actually fragmented, unless that is totally understood, your minds are incapable of perception.

It is only a mind that is not tortured, that is not distorted, that is very clear, that has no markings of any kind of conflict, it is only such a mind that can see what truth is, and therefore can live. Now one must be aware of this issue not only within oneself but socially - the wars, the demand for peace, the way of the politician, the way of the saints, this diversified conflict. What is the root cause of all this? Is it the fault of the environment, the education that one has, the culture in which one lives - which is the environment? Is it the fault of the environment that you are constantly in conflict not only during the day but also when you sleep, from the moment you are born till you die? If you are really aware of it, if you are aware that in yourself you are fragmented, are broken up, contradictory, then you must have asked why does man live in this state.

And it is you who have created the environment, society in which you live, the religions and gods which you have accepted. Your gods are your projections. So you are responsible for the conflict and for the environment and for the society in which you live, the beliefs, the dogmas, the rituals. You are completely, utterly responsible for the environment and for the society in which you live. So when you are aware of it, that is, aware intensely,

passionately, not just verbally, when you actually feel it, that you are the world and the world is you, then what happens?

I do not know if you have asked this question of why conflict exists in man, in yourself. If you have, what is your answer? Do you refer to what somebody has said about why you live in conflict - Sankara or the Buddha - do you refer to some authority? Do you do that when you ask yourself this question why you, as a human being, responsible for the whole structure of the environment in which you live and of which you are a part, why there is this conflict in you? Can anybody answer this question for you? If they do answer it, it will be merely a description, an explanation. But the explanation and the description are not the explained nor the described.

So you have to totally disregard authority. You have to find out why you are in conflict. Now to find out you need energy. You need a great deal of energy to find out for yourself the cause why man, you, live in conflict.

Now when you enquire into the cause of it, you are using the intellect as an instrument of analysis, aren't you? You are using intellect as an instrument of analysis with which you hope to find the cause. The intellect is partial, is a fragment of the total. You hope to find the cause of a tremendous question, why man is in conflict, through a fragmentary thing called the intellect, which is the only instrument you have. So when you begin to enquire into the cause through the intellect, your answer will be partial, because your intellect is partial, and therefore, that is not the instrument. Which means you must now discard the instrument and find out a different kind of instrument.

Up to now we have used the intellect as an analytical means to find out why man suffers, why man is in conflict; and the intellect is a fragment of the total. Man is not just his intellect. There is all his nervous organism, the emotions - the whole structure - and you take one part of it and try to use that one part to find the cause. When you examine through a partial instrument, your understanding will always be partial and therefore incomplete.

And you have to see that you need energy, don't you? Now, the energy we have is divided, is again fragmented. There is the energy of fragmentation. In these fragments there is energy, just as in heat there is energy; and in the control of that energy, there is also energy. So we have divided energy into fragments, whereas human energy, cosmic energy, every kind of energy is a unitary movement. So one has to have energy to understand the structure and the nature of conflict and the ending of conflict. You must have intense energy and not fragmented energy, the fragmented energy is that which says, "I must get rid of conflict".

Who is the "I" that says I must get rid of conflict or suppress it? It is one part of energy describing another part of energy. So energies are in conflict. We are asking what is the reason of this conflict. One can observe it very simply as the observer and the observed. There is in you the observer, the observer watches that tree with all his knowledge, his past conditioning, and he looks at that tree as something separate from himself.

The observer says, "Do this, do not do that." The observer has certain values, certain judgements, he is really the censor, who is always watching, denying, controlling, separating himself from that which he is watching. When you are angry or jealous or not

generous, if you observe it very closely, there is the observer who says "I am jealous, I am angry" The naming of the reaction, which he calls anger, separates him from anger. Can you look at that tree without naming, without the interference of thought which is the response of memory, but just observe? We talked about it briefly the other day, which is, you look at that tree through the image which you have about that tree, which means you are not really looking at that tree. In the same way, when you have an image about your wife or your husband or a friend, you are looking at the friend through the image you have. So there is duality. This division between the observer and the observed is the very essence of conflict, of division.

When I am angry, at the moment of anger, there is no observer. Please follow this, I am going to go into it step by step. Follow it by observing yourself and not what the speaker is pointing out. Observe what takes place yourself, in yourself. When you are angry, at the moment of experiencing that anger or any other experience, in that second, there is no observer; a second later the observer comes and says, "I have been angry". He has separated himself from anger. He has named it, named the feeling as anger. He has named it, in order to strengthen his memory. His memory says "you have been angry". The memory is the censor, the memory says, "You should not have been angry", "be kind, don't hit him back, turn the other cheek." So the response of memory as thought becomes the observer and so there is a division between the observer and the observed, when he says "I am angry, I am jealous; I am envious.

Then the conflict begins, because he wants to suppress envy or

enlarge it, take delight in it. So where there is the observer and the observed, there is the root of conflict.

Now is there an observation of anger without the observer? That is the next question. At the moment of anger or pleasure there is no observer, then a second later comes the observer, the observer is the censor, is the recorder, is the memory, is the brain cells in which these memories are held, and hence that observer says, "I should not or I should, I want more, I want less." So one asks then, can there be an observation without the observer? You understand? This is a tremendous question. We are conditioned to this conflict which arises when there is an observer different from the thing observed. That is our tradition, that is our condition, that is the result of our culture. And when we function from habit, it is a waste of energy. And when we immediately respond, that is, when the observer immediately responds to an emotion or a reaction, the response is always the old, it is the old brain which responds. So we are asking whether there is an observation without the observer. To end any habit, any tradition, without conflict, needs energy.

Look, let us make it simple. I am angry; at the moment of anger there is no observer as "I" who says I am angry. A second later, the entity as the observer comes into being. He is the censor, who says "I must not be angry." The response of the observer is tradition, is the habit, is the old brain responding, and that response of the old brain is a waste of energy, and you need energy totally to observe without the observer. Are you following this?

Let us put the question differently. What is your life, the daily life, not the ideological life, not the life you would like to lead, not the life you hope to have, but the actual daily "what is"? What is

your life? It is a battle, is it not, with occasional flashes of pleasure, whether it be sexual or other forms of sensuous pleasure? Your life is a constant battle. Can that battle end?

Now, to end that battle, you must look at the whole field of existence, not partially but totally - "total" meaning the sorrows, the physical pain, the insults, the fears, the hopes, the anxieties, the ambitions, the regrets, the competitive, aggressive, brutal existence - see the whole of it. We are used to seeing parts of it, not taking the whole field and looking. We are not capable, as we are, of observing the whole field as one, because we have divided life into business life, family life, religious life and so on, and each division has its own activity of energy, and therefore each fragment is against the other fragment, and these fragmentary energies are wasting our total energy.

Is it possible to look at this whole field, this complex existence, the economic side, the social side, the family side, the personal, the communal - the whole of it as one - to perceive it totally? To perceive it totally, you must have a mind that is non-fragmented. How do you come by that? How does a mind that is so fragmented throw away all the fragments and have a perception that is total? Have you understood my question? I cannot see the whole complex existence through a little hole which I call the intellect. I cannot see it, because the intellect is a part and you cannot use the part to understand the whole. That is a simple fact. There must be a different kind of perception, and that quality of perception exists only when the observer is absent, when you can look at that tree without the image, when you can look at your wife or your husband without any image whatsoever, when you can look at a

Muslim, and a Muslim can look at you without the image. These images are produced by the observer, and if you see the truth of it, not merely the logical sequence of it, but see the fact of it, the truth of it - as you would see the danger of a snake and you act instantly. So when you see the truth that conflict exists as long as there is an observer - and the observer is the producer of images, he is the tradition, he is the conditioned being, he is the censor, - if you see that, not as an idea but actually, then you will observe without the observer, then you will see the totality of existence.

Therefore, a mind that sees this has tremendous energy, because energy then is not dissipated. We dissipate energy through control. Have you ever watched a sannyasi or a monk who has taken vows of celibacy, poverty? What tortures he goes through, because he has got the image that truth, or whatever that sublime thing is, can be found only if he is celibate, because he says that otherwise there is a wastage of energy, sexual wastage of energy. You must have complete energy to find reality; but in himself he is in battle. Right, you have understood this? So he has an image that he should be a celibate, and that image creates a division between himself and actually "what is".

Now if you can observe actually "what is" without a censor, there is a transformation of "what is". One is violent - that is apparently the normal human condition - to be violent. I am violent. At the moment of violence there is no observer, then a few seconds later the observer comes into being. He says "I should not be violent" because he has an image of non- violence, an ideal of non-violence which prevents him from observing violence. So he says, I say to myself "I will be every day less and less violent, I

will ultimately reach a state of non-violence day by day." Now what is implied in that simple fact that I am violent and I will be non-violent one day? First there is the observer and the observed, second he is sowing the seeds of violence in the meantime, before he arrives at the state of non-violence. Then there is the factor of time before he can be completely non-violent, that is, the space between violence and non-violence; in that myself "I will be every day less and less violent, I will ultimately reach a state of non-violence day by day." Now what is implied in that simple fact that I am violent and I will be non-violent one day? First there is the observer and the observed, second he is sowing the seeds of violence in the meantime, before he arrives at the state of non-violence. Then there is the factor of time before he can be completely non-violent, that is, the space between violence and non-violence; in that observe "what is". Now, how do you observe "what is"? Do you observe it with your conditioned mind, saying "I must not be violent" with the image which you have about violence? Or is there an observation without the word, without the image? To observe without the image requires tremendous energy. Then you are not wasting energy by suppressing violence or transforming violence or pursuing an ideal of non-violence. That is all wastage of energy.

Now in the same way, let us look at this whole problem of what is called love. We have looked at what we consider living, which is a shoddy affair, a battle, and by investigating we have seen that it is possible - not intellectually-actually to be free of that conflict. Now let us enquire deeply into this question of what love is - not your opinion, somebody's opinion or conclusion - but what actually

it is now. What is love? Is it pleasure, is it desire, is it sex, is it jealousy, possessiveness, domination, dependency? If you depend, then you are caught in fear. Right? If I depend on my wife, because she gives me pleasure sexually, if I depend on her for comfort, companionship, that dependency breeds fear, that dependency breeds jealousy, hatred, antagonism, possessiveness, the desire to dominate. Is all that love? Question, go into it, find out. And is pleasure associated with sex, is it love?

And why has sex become so extremely important in life? Why, Sirs, why in the modern world and also in the ancient world, why have we made sex into such a colossal affair? Why have we said that you cannot possibly attain reality, enlightenment, if you are sexual? Let us find out.

First of all, you have to enquire into what is pleasure. You see a beautiful tree, a lovely cloud, the face of a child that is enchanting, the face of a man or woman that is beautiful. You see it, then what takes place? You see the lovely moonlight on the water, sparkling with such beauty, you perceive it. Then, at that moment of tremendous experience, thought comes along and says, "How lovely that was, I want to repeat it tomorrow." Are you following all this? Thought, which is the response of memory, which has the experience of seeing that moonlight on the water, the beauty of it, that thought says, "I must repeat that thing again." At the moment of perception of that light on the water there was nothing, there was neither pleasure nor the demand that it must happen tomorrow. There was absolute realization of that beauty. Then thought comes and says, "Let us repeat it; go tomorrow and look at that water again."

So that is pleasure - the repetition of an event which thought has reduced to pleasure and so thought can continue and give strength to pleasure. You have to understand this. There has been physical pain, a bad toothache last week. You are frightened that it will come back again tomorrow, next week, which is the action of thought. Thought sustains both pleasure and fear. So thought has built this whole structure round love as pleasure. And therefore all the saints, religions say, "Do not look at a woman, suppress, control", which is what takes place. That is a battle. Therefore, you are wasting energy. So what is love? Is it pleasure, fear? Fear is jealousy, violence. When you possess your wife as "my wife" is that not violence, and is that love?

And we are asking, why is it human beings have made sex into an extraordinary affair? Have you ever thought about it? Have you observed why, in your own life, that has become of such significant importance? Have you noticed how your life is mechanical - going to the office every day, repeat, repeat. How extraordinarily mechanical you are, when you quote your religious books, the rituals, when you call yourself a Hindu, a Muslim, a Christian, a communist, and God knows what else. It is a mechanical habit, a repetition. When you name yourself as a bureaucrat, as a politician, as a sociologist, and so on, it is a habit, a mechanical acquisition of knowledge which you can repeat.

So you have only one thing which is not competitive, non-repetitive, which you can reduce to repetitiveness, which is sex. So that becomes your relief from the mechanical life. You have made love into a mechanical, pleasurable affair. And is that love?

You know, to find out what it is, you have to deny completely

what it is not. You have to deny - the denial is the understanding of what pleasure, fear is. The understanding of it, not the saying of "I must not have pleasure", which is like a man saying "I must have no desire" - that is what you are trained to, that is what you accept by your tradition, that desire is completely wrong, that you must go beyond it.

You know, when you look at a tree, the beauty of a leaf, the shadow, the movement of the leaf, to look at it is a delight. What is wrong with it? Because you have denied beauty, your life has become mechanical. You never look at a tree, on the contrary, you are cutting down trees; you never look at the sky, the clouds, the beauty of the land, because you have an idea at the back of your mind that, to be a really religious man, you must never look at anything beautiful, because beauty might remind you of a woman. And that is what you call religion, and that is the way you are going to find God. It is such infantilism, because you torture the mind to find God. To find reality, you must have a free mind, not a tortured mind, there must be this sense of love, not with all its jealousies, fears. You do not know what it means to love, the beauty of it, because you do not know what it means to live a beautiful life, a life without conflict; you only know a life which is committed to some pattern or another, and therefore broken up. You have broken up living from dying. See what is involved in it.

There is death far away. You may put it away from you, but you know it is going to come one of these days, so you invent theories - reincarnation. Is there a next life? If you really believed in reincarnation, really believed in it, that is, that you will be born next life according to what you do in this life, then this life matters

much more than the next life, which means what you do now matters, how you behave now matters. But you really do not believe in it. It means absolutely nothing; it is just a theory because it gives you a temporary comfort. But if you really believed in it, then every minute of the day would count, every action would have significance. Therefore, now is the moment of righteousness, not next life. I do not know if you understand all this. And you have got innumerable theories about death. And you have never faced it.

So, find out the nature of death, while living, full of vitality, energy, not when you are diseased, unconscious, in pain, misery. Then that is not the moment to find out what death is - but while you are capable of looking, walking, observing being aware of the world, outside and inside, when you have understood what living is and what it means to love.

So what is death? The old people put this question out of fear because they are going to die. The old generation offers you nothing but theories about death. They have nothing to offer you either traditionally or actually. What have they offered you culturally, socially, economically? Do look at it, Sir, what have they given you - a social structure that is so corrupt, so full of injustice, a structure that breeds war, nationalism and all the rest. And any intelligent man discards it totally, including their morality. So what have they to offer you, the older generation who are frightened of death? Nothing except a lot of words and fear. So do not accept what another man says about death. Let us find out what it means.

What does it mean to die, not of old age, crippled and diseased or by an accident, but sitting here, conscious, aware, listening with

a mind that is really serious? Now we are asking what it is to die, having no fear. You know only what it means to end, not what it means to die, that is, the ending of what you know, your accumulated knowledge, your insults, your hopes, your family, your wife, your children, whom you think you love. If you really loved your children, you would have a different world. So what does it mean to die? You are afraid of the ending of the known, you are not afraid of death, because of that you know nothing.

So what is it that you are frightened of, frightened of ending the known, and what is the known? All your memories, the collection of your worries, the furniture, the house, the accumulated insults and worries and conflicts and sorrows, and you hold on to that and say, "Please, I do not want to die". Is that what you are afraid of - afraid of letting go the known - not of death? Now let go of the known, let go of some memory that you have, let go, completely, of the pleasures that you have, the accumulated memories, the regrets, the anxieties, die to it, completely so that your mind is totally fresh. That is what it means to die, so that you don't carry over all the memories, the shoddy experiences or the pleasurable experiences. Live each day without accumulation, and you will know what it means to die so completely that your mind is fresh tomorrow, young and innocent and full of that energy. Without that, do what you will, without love, without the understanding of the beauty of this dying, you will never come near to that which is un-nameable.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 8 3RD PUBLIC TALK MADRAS 13TH JANUARY 1971

As we have talked about so many other things like fear, pleasure, and the ending of sorrow, I think we ought to talk over together the question of meditation. That word is loaded, specially in the East. One has all kinds of ideas of what meditation is, what systems to follow, what methods, what practices, what disciplines, and I think we ought to consider this, because it is part of life like death, love, and this sense of great beauty. Meditation also is not only a part but perhaps covers the whole field of life.

I do not quite know how to begin, because it is rather a complex thing and we ought to begin, I think, by considering that one must change radically, totally one's way of living, not only outwardly in our relationships, in our attitudes and activities, but also inwardly, most profoundly. There must be really a marvellous change so that our minds are entirely different. Yet as man, centuries upon centuries, has sought a way of life that is not worldly and so has escaped from life, he has denied living and created his own idea of what a religious life is and if we are going into this question of meditation and what a religious life, what a religious mind is, we must turn our back upon everything that man has thought about what meditation is or what a religious life is. We have totally to abnegate, deny all that.

So we will begin by seeing what is not meditation, and through negation come to the positive. You must negate not merely verbally, or intellectually, theoretically, but actually negate every

thing that man has said. One has to find out for oneself, because truth is something not to be bought through another. It is not something fixed, something that you can repeatedly add to in order to discover it. Please do realize that if one is really serious, one must totally negate all the propaganda, for religion is a continuous propaganda. You are told what to do, what to think, either for over 5000 years or for 2000 years. So you must, if you are serious, totally put aside all that and find out for yourself what truth is, if there is such a thing. So it is important to understand yourself, not what others say about yourself. If you followed a psychologist or a philosopher or an analytical, intellectual person, or one of the ancient teachers, however ancient, respected and all the rest of it, you are merely following what they are telling you about yourself. Therefore, you have to deny all that, and then you begin to find out what you are.

And meditation is part of this, because without knowing yourself, not only superficially but at the very depths of your being, you have no basis for any action, you have no foundation whatsoever on which you can build a house that is stable, orderly. So it is absolutely necessary if you would really take this extraordinary journey, and that is what we are going to do: journey together into this enormous, complex problem of understanding oneself. Please see the absolute, essential necessity of it, that nobody can teach you about yourself except yourself, so you have to be the guru, the disciple yourself, the teacher yourself, and learn from yourself. What you learn from another is not true. So you have to find out for yourself what you are and to learn how to observe yourself.

You know it is one of the most arduous tasks to go into this. It is like taking a journey together. You know when you walk together you must be friends, you must love walking together, and that is one of the most difficult things. To learn about oneself is not to accumulate knowledge about oneself. To learn about myself I have to observe myself. If I learn about myself through the accumulation of knowledge, I don't learn about myself.

There are two ways of learning: to learn in order to accumulate knowledge and from knowledge observe, observe through the screen of the past. I learn about myself, observe myself, having experience and accumulating knowledge from those experiences and looking at myself through those experiences. That is, I look at myself through the past, for knowledge is the past. That is one way of looking at oneself. The other is to observe and watch the movement of all the thoughts, of all the motives, and never accumulate. Therefore, learning is a constant process.

I see this needs further explanation. I see myself being violent, and I have condemned it or justified it, and I have learnt from it that there should be no violence. I have learnt from it. Next time I observe myself being violent, I respond according to my knowledge of what I have learnt. And, therefore, there is no fresh observation. I am looking at the new experience of violence with old eyes, with previous knowledge. Therefore I am not learning. Learning implies a constant movement, not from the past, but a movement from moment to moment so that there is no accumulation. We are the result of thousands of accumulations, we are accumulating, and if you would understand that accumulation, you have to learn about it and not further accumulate. So there

must be an observation which is a constant learning without accumulation. Accumulation is the centre, is the "me", the ego; and to learn about it one must be free of accumulation and not accumulate at another level in a different direction.

So there must be learning about oneself by watching, not condemning, not justifying, but just watching, the way you walk, the way you talk, the words you use, the motives, the purposes, the intentions - to be totally aware without any choice. And that awareness is not a matter of accumulation but of being aware from moment to moment. When you are not aware, do not bother. Begin again, so that your mind is always fresh. Therefore the learning about oneself is not only at the conscious level, superficial level, but also at the deeper level: the so-called unconscious, the hidden. How are you going to learn about something that is very deeply rooted, hidden, not open? Our whole consciousness is both superficial and hidden; and one has to learn the content of all that consciousness, because the content makes up the consciousness. The two are not separate, the content is the consciousness.

Therefore, to understand the content there must be an observation without the observer. You know this is one of the most fascinating things in life, to find out how to look anew at life. To observe the hidden, one has to have eyes that are not conditioned by the past as a Hindu, Christian, and all the rest of it. One must look at oneself as though for the first time, each time and therefore never accumulate. If you can so observe yourself in action in the office, with the family, with the children, when you are sexual, when you are greedy, ambitious, observe without condemning it, without justifying it, just observe, then you will see that in that

observation there is no conflict whatsoever. And a mind that comes with a tortured, with a distorted mind, can never possibly find out what truth is. And most of our minds are distorted, tortured, made small by control, by discipline, by fear.

Psychologists say that you must dream, otherwise you go mad. There must be dreams when you sleep, there must take place dreams. Please be interested in this, because you dream in life every night. When you sleep, some kind of dream, activity, goes on; and they say that it is essential for human sanity that you must dream. Now we are going to question it, going to find out whether it is absolutely necessary to dream at all. So we have to discard what the professionals have said and find out for ourselves. We have to ask ourselves what dreams are. Are not dreams the continuation of the activity of daily life, only in symbolic form? Please do not agree or disagree. We are enquiring together, taking the journey together, therefore, there is no agreement or disagreement. We are both of us observing, we are asking whether it is necessary to dream at all.

And what are dreams? Are they not the movement of daily life, the daily observations, the daily wrangles, all the misfortunes, violence, bitterness, anger, the movement of all that continuing while you are asleep, only taking a symbolic, visual or a verbal form? You find out. If you have observed you will see that the brain needs order, otherwise it cannot function rationally. Have you noticed before you go to asleep that you review the day, and you say to yourself, "I should have said that differently, I should have done that in a different way, I should not have said that, I wish it had not happened, I must correct it tomorrow?" Haven't you

noticed that you review the day just before you go off to sleep? Why? Because if you do not do it consciously, while you are asleep the mind is spending its energy to bring order within itself. Are you following all this? Look, order is necessary in daily life not only when you are asleep. The brain demands that you have an orderly, sane life, otherwise it cannot function efficiently.. And order is virtue, because if you are not virtuous, if you are disorderly, how can the brain function? It can only operate excellently when it is secure, when it has order within itself. Haven't you noticed all these things?

So while you are asleep, while the body is asleep, the dream is bringing about order in itself, because next day it has to face disorder again; therefore it must have some capacity to bring order out of disorder, and the bringing about of order is a form of dream. But if you in the waking hours establish order, then the brain, while the physical body is asleep, can live a totally different kind of life. Look, this is part of meditation. A mind that has no order, that is disorderly, doing one thing, saying another, acting another way, as we do, such a mind cannot possibly understand what meditation is. There must be order. Now, how do you establish, how does the mind, the brain establish order during the day, order being virtue? We are not talking of social morality but of a virtue that is orderly.

Now order is not a blueprint established by the Gita, the Bible, by the teacher. Order is a living thing; it is not a blueprint. If you have a blueprint, then there is disorder between what you are and what you should be. Therefore, in that there is contradiction, there is conflict. Conflict indicates disorder. So you can only find out what order is if you learn what disorder is. In the understanding of

what disorder is, you have order. Our daily life as we live is disorderly, is it not?

Would you say, your life, if you are honest to yourself, was very orderly, very sane, balanced, harmonious? Obviously not. If it was, you would not be sitting here. You would be free human beings, marvellous human beings, establishing a different kind of society; but we are disorderly human beings, contradictory. So observe without denying, justifying, just observe your disorder, how contradictory you are, how frightened you are, how envious you are, seeking prestige, position, bullied by your wife or husband, a slave to what your neighbour thinks of you - a constant conflict, struggle. Observe that without justifying or condemning. Learn all about that disorder and you will see that out of that comes an extraordinarily sweet order with a movement, with a life, with a vigour. Then you will see that during the day you have established complete order in your life, a mathematically precise order. And to understand that, you have to understand fear, you have to understand pleasure - which we went into briefly the other day. And by being aware of them choicelessly, you will see that when you go to sleep your mind then has no dreams at all. Therefore such a mind, such a brain is made fresh during sleep, renews itself, and therefore, the next morning you will find the brain has an extraordinary capacity.

And that is part of understanding oneself. You must love this, you must give your life to this, because it is your life, you must give your life to understand your life, because you are the world and the world is you. If you change, you change the world. This is not merely an intellectual idea, you must burn with this, you must

have passion. And meditation is the release of tremendous energy.

You know, to change the environment there must be a system, a method, A method, system, is to act efficiently. Just follow this. If you want to change the environment round here, there must be a planning of what to do. If you want to build a house, you have to plan. And when you establish a system, what takes place?

Outwardly what takes place? There must be a few who will be capable of running that system. Then what happens to the people who run the system? They become much more important than the system or the consideration of changing the environment. Haven't you noticed all this? They are the bosses, they are the people who use the system in order to become important themselves, like politicians the world over. Please follow this. To bring about an environmental change, there needs to be an efficient group of people with a system. But the efficient people are human beings, they are angry, jealous, envious, they want a position. You have seen all this, haven't you? Therefore they use the system and forget the whole business.

Now we want a system to meditate. See the relationship between the two. We think we could be efficient in our meditation, in our thinking, in our enquiry, if there was a system. Now what does the system imply? Please bear in mind very clearly the distinction between the two. If you want to change the physical environment, there must be a group of people who are efficient to carry out that system, they must be impersonal, not egotistic, not lining their own pockets metaphorically and physically. Therefore human beings matter more than the system. Do you see the importance of it?

We say the same thing about bringing about a change in ourselves, that only through a system we can change, only through a system we can learn what meditation is. Because that appears to offer efficiency. Does it? You know every little guru in India and elsewhere has a system of meditation. Now systems imply a repetition, a practice, following a method. If you follow a method, a system, a practice, it becomes a routine; then there is an escape through sex or through different forms. Therefore, at all costs, avoid any system of meditation because a mechanical mind can never possibly find out what truth is. The mechanical mind can become very disciplined, orderly, but that orderliness is contradictory to the order which we are talking about, because in that orderliness which is so-called repetition, there is contradiction between what you are and what you should be, the ideal. So there is contradiction in that; and where there is contradiction there is distortion and a tortured mind can never find out anything new. So do not belong to any system, do not follow any guru.

You know once a very famous guru came to see us. It was a rather amusing incident. Some of us were sitting on a little mattress, as big as this, and out of politeness we got up and we asked the important man to sit on the mattress. He sat. He had a stick. He put the stick in front of him, sat very dignified, and he became the guru, because he was on a little mattress. He was telling us all what we should do, because out of politeness we offered the little seat which was an inch higher. Vanity and the demand for power and position and followers - such people will never find out what truth is. They will find what they want, which is their own gratification.

There is no system, but if you understand there is no system, then your mind becomes alive, sharp, to find out. Now what is it that you are going to find out? We want, most of us, to experience something other than the daily experiences. We want to experience a transcendental state, an experience of enlightenment. The word "experience" means to go through, and when you demand to have greater experiences, that indicates that you are bored with daily living. All the people who take drugs think that through drugs they will have extraordinary experiences. They do take a trip. Their trips, their experiences are the expressions of their own conditioning. It gives them a certain vitality, a certain clarity, but that has nothing whatsoever to do with enlightenment. So through drugs you cannot possibly come upon it.

So what is it that we are seeking? What is it that man wants? He sees what his life is, a boredom, a routine, a battlefield, a fight, a constant struggle - never a moment of peace except perhaps occasionally, sexually or otherwise. So he says life is transient, life is changing, there must be something extraordinarily permanent, and he wants that permanence, something other than the mere physical, the daily routine and experience, and he calls that God. So he believes in God; and all the images, rituals are based on belief. Belief is the outcome of fear. If there is no fear, you can see the leaf, the tree, the beautiful sky, the light on the birds - there is beauty, and where there is beauty there is goodness, where there is goodness there is truth.

So one must understand the daily living. We must understand why our lives have become mechanical, why we follow others, why we believe, not-believe, fight. We know what is going on in

daily life and we want to escape from it. Therefore, we want wider, deeper experiences. And books, gurus, teachers promise enlightenment, that extraordinary thing. And systems offer you that, that is, "Do these things and you will get there, follow this path and you will find yourself there".....as though truth is like a station fixed and all the roads leading to it.

There is no road, there is no path, there is no fixed truth; and therefore you must have a mind that is extraordinarily alive, watching, learning.

Then there is this whole question of concentration. I do not know who tells you these things that you must concentrate, learn to control thought, that you must suppress desires, you must be this, never look at a woman, never look at a man. I do not know why you ever listen to this. Have you ever concentrated, that is, fixed your attention on something? A school boy, when he wants to look out of the window and see the movement of the leaves, the tree or the passer-by, and the teacher says "Look at the book, do not look out of the window: that is concentration; that is, focus your attention and build a wall round yourself so that you are not disturbed. Concentration becomes exclusion, resistance. Do you see this? And in that concentration there is a battle. You want to concentrate and your mind goes off, your thought chases something or other, so there is conflict, whereas if you give attention, if you are attentive during the day, even for a few minutes at a time, completely attentive - giving your mind, your body, your heart, your eyes, your ears, your brain - completely, totally attentive, then you will see there is no border to attention, there is not a resistance. In that state of attention there is no

contradiction. Be attentive and then forget it, begin again, pick it up each time, so that this attention is fresh each time, and then you will know when you are not attentive. Then in that state of non-attention is conflict, then observe that conflict, be aware of that conflict, give your total attention to that conflict, so that the mind becomes extraordinarily alive, non-mechanical. That is part of meditation.

Then you are being told that you must acquire a silent mind, aren't you? Even the speaker has told you that. Forget what the speaker has said, but see for yourself why your mind must be quiet, must be silent, see it for yourself. To see anything clearly, your mind must not chatter. If I want to listen to what you are saying, my mind must be quiet, mustn't it? If I want to understand what you are saying, I must listen to you. When I am listening to you, if I am thinking about something, I cannot listen. You see the point? Therefore, to listen, to observe, the mind must be quiet. That is all.

Now you ask, how is the mind to be quiet when it is chattering all the time about something or other? If you try to stop the chattering, then that becomes a conflict. The mind has got into the habit of chattering, talking to itself or talking with somebody else, endlessly, using words, words. And if you try to stop that by the action of will, then that is a contradiction.

Therefore, find out why your mind chatters, enquire into it, understand it. It does not matter very much if it chatters. Why does it chatter? Because it must be occupied with something. You know people say, "You must be committed to something, to some activity, you must be totally involved", and the mind is totally involved in chattering. And why does it chatter? Because it has to

be occupied. Why does it demand to be occupied? I am asking it for you, but find out, ask what would happen if it did not chatter, if it was not occupied. If your mind was not occupied, what would happen? It would face emptiness, wouldn't it? If the habit stops suddenly, you feel lost.

And this emptiness is the fear of your own loneliness and you try to escape from this loneliness, from this fear, from this emptiness by chattering, or by being occupied with this or that. So, go deep into the very depth of this loneliness, not trying to suppress it or escape from it, but just to observe it. And you can only observe it if your mind is quiet, because the moment you condemn it, the moment you say, "I must not chatter", then you have conflict. But if you merely observe your own loneliness, then you will find that your mind facing this emptiness becomes completely alone.

There is a difference between loneliness and aloneness. Loneliness is isolation, total isolation, which is what we are doing all the time in daily life. During the daily activity you are isolating yourself - you may be married, you may sleep with your wife or not, but what takes place? You have your own ambitions, greed, problems, and she has her own problems; you are trying to establish a relationship between various problems; so this self-centred activity is loneliness. The self-centred activity is isolating, and therefore there is this sense of appalling, frightening loneliness.

And when you understand this, you have that aloneness which comes when the mind and the brain cells have understood this whole problem, which is, the denial of all authority - of all spiritual

authority, the authority of another or the authority of your own accumulated knowledge as experience, which is the past. When you discard totally in yourself all authority, when you are no longer following any system and when you have understood fear, pleasure, then in that understanding of fear and pleasure, there is joy. Joy has nothing whatsoever to do with pleasure. You may have a moment of great joy, but thinking about it reduces it to pleasure.

Order is not a blueprint; it comes with the understanding of disorder - that is your life. Virtue is a living thing like humility; you cannot cultivate humility. So when all this is done the mind becomes extraordinarily clear, unconfused, and therefore it is alone. Out of this aloneness comes a quality of silence, which is not the result of practice, which is not the opposite of noise. That silence is without cause, and therefore it has no beginning and no end. And to such a mind, absolutely orderly, and therefore completely alone, and therefore innocent - which means that it can never be hurt - comes a marvellous silence.

What happens in that silence, there are no words to describe. If you describe what happens, then those words are not the thing - what is described. The description is not the described. Therefore, truth, that blessedness, that extraordinary silence. and the movement of that silence has no words, and if you have gone that far, then you are enlightened, you do not seek anything, you do not want any experience, then you are a light, and that is the beginning and the ending of all meditation.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 9

4TH PUBLIC TALK MADRAS 17TH JANUARY

1971

WE seem to think that the moment we have acquired some technical knowledge at a University or an institution like this we have fulfilled all responsibility. Yet having neglected the vast field of life with all its complexities, merely cultivating a particular knowledge apparently has not solved any of our human problems. One may be able to go to the moon or create marvellous superstructures or live under the sea and so on, but the human relationship with its problems has not been solved. And education, one hoped, would not only build a technological world where man would be freed from the machine to do other things, but also he would lead a different kind of life, a different kind of existence, bringing about a different society, a different culture, a totally different religion. Education has not fulfilled that, nor science, nor government, nor communism, nor any other kind of theoretical, ideological utopia.

So we are faced with the problem of human relationship, how to bring about in that relationship a radical change, because human relationship is society, is the structure, the nature of society. If one is at all serious in a world that is so chaotic, so mad, so brutal, so meaningless, one has not only to transform the outward structure but also the inward psychological states of our mind and our consciousness. We are not separate from the world, we are the world. We have created, the past generation has created, this mad, stupid world; and the younger generation, if they are not careful, if

they are not alert, not watchful, will also join the older generation in a few years and bring about another mad, stupid society. So it is a tremendous responsibility not only on the part of the educator but also on the part of the student to consider what kind of world we are going to live in - not a world of utopia or a perfect technological world, but a world of human relationship where we can live and function at peace with each other. I think that is the tremendous problem that is facing the world at the present time.

One sees what is actually happening - revolt, destruction, brutality, war, disruption, anarchy. If we are at all observant, if we are aware at all of what is going on - the utter, mad chaos - then it behoves us as human beings to see what our minds, our hearts can do about this transformation of the human mind. Philosophers have not done that. Philosophers have spun innumerable theories, marvellous, sociological or religious theories, or a world of higher mathematics; but actually they have not changed the world. No philosophy has ever changed the world. Philosophy means the love of truth, not the truth of yours or that of the speaker, but actually what is. It means finding out "what is", the actual, not the theoretical, not the abstract, whether the actual, the "what is" can be totally changed. That is what we are concerned with or should be concerned with. When the house is on fire, not to indulge in talking about the theories of combustion. We are confronted with a world that is aflame, that is chaotic, that is so utterly confused. So it comes as a responsibility on the part of each one of us to see what one can as a human being, do in this chaos. And there is no question whatsoever about this chaos, the political divisions, the national divisions, the regional divisions and also the religious - the

Catholic, the Protestant, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Muslim - the varieties of division that organized religions have created throughout the world.

When you have observed all this, not from reading a newspaper, sitting in a comfortable chair or as a professor in a university theorizing about it, but actually facing the problem, confronting what the human responsibility is with regard to this problem, you will ask how the human mind which has been put together through millennia, through so-called evolution, that mind so heavily conditioned as a Hindu, Buddhist, communist and so on, how can that mind, which is the intellect, ever bring about a radical revolution? It can probably bring a physical revolution - the Communist, the French and other forms of revolution. The intellect can theorize and force people to conform to a particular pattern of society, which is what is happening in certain parts of the world. So when you observe all this, you ask what is the human being to do? You cannot escape from it - either religiously, economically or inwardly withdraw. You cannot possibly escape from this chaos, because we are related to it. We have bred this chaos, we have brought it into being by our daily life. So seeing this, what can one do? As a human being, confronted with this enormous problem, being related to that problem, not as an observer but as one who takes part in it, who is contributing to it, what can he do? How can he as a human being, transform both outwardly and inwardly, psychologically and socially? What can he do? I do not know if you are interested in this question at all. Most of us are not, because we have certain formulas, certain ideals, concepts through which we hope to resolve these problems, and we hope through the

particular system, a particular method - whether it is the communist or other systems - we are going to change the world. Systems are created by human beings, by you, by the clever people; and one hopes, one desires that through the system a particular change can be brought about.

But to run the system, human beings are necessary. That is, you and I are necessary to run the system; and we as human beings remain unchanged. We try to run the system, and therefore become not only slaves to the system but seek power through the system, which again is what is obviously happening in the world. So again, what is one to do? You understand my question, you sitting here, educated in this place, or having been educated elsewhere, taken some degrees and having a job - if you can get it - and having settled down comfortably in a little house with a family and wife, children, with your particular idiosyncrasies, religious doctrine? and beliefs, stuck in a little corner, cultivating a very small part of a vast field of existence, what can you do?

This question is not a rhetorical question. It is not just put because one has to say something. It is put because we have to share the problem together, because it is your problem, it is your daily problem, whether you are occupied, whether you have a profession; whether you are unemployed, whether you are a Naxalite or a Communist or what you will. It is your problem and whether that problem can be solved at all is what we are going to try to find out this evening: to communicate, to share together, not intellectually, not verbally but actually. We are going to see how, if it is at all possible, to bring about a change, a psychological revolution, because if you merely bring about a physical revolution

through violence, inevitably as history has pointed out, you will end up either having a dictatorship, or the dictatorship of a bureaucracy. So physical revolution is the most primitive, meaningless revolution, because the same pattern is repeated - modified perhaps - but again and again repeated. So what is necessary is a psychological revolution, an inward revolution.

Then the question is, how is this possible? How is a mind with its brain cells which have been conditioned as a Hindu, as a Protestant, and all the rest of that, how is that mind to undergo a radical change psychologically to bring about a revolution in ourselves, and therefore bring about a totally different kind of world? If we cannot do that, all education has no meaning whatsoever. It might give you a job in a competitive world but you have not solved the problem at all. The problem is so vast, one has to apply not only the capacity of the intellect but also all other faculties which we have.

The capacity of the intellect is to reason, collect data, as the computer does, objectively, explore sanely. And a good intellect does not come to a conclusion. It examines, it explores, but if the intellect is conditioned by personal demands, by personal prejudices, conditioned by the culture in which it lives, it is incapable of exploring, it is incapable of understanding. The intellect will not find the answer. That is obvious, is it not? You can go to the moon - intellect is efficient enough - or do the most fantastic things it is doing in the world, build the whole structure of an army that is ready to destroy. But the intellect divides people. The division between private life and public life, the division of nationalities, linguistic and all the rest of the various forms of

division are brought about by the intellect, which is one of the functions of the intellect. And, probably the major function is to think, and thought, right throughout the world, both religious thought and worldly thought, has brought about this division, And thought tries to solve this problem, the problem of human relationship.

So one has to understand the whole structure and the nature of thinking, not according to any philosopher or psychologist but actually observe one's own thinking. Perhaps what I am going to say may be heretical, because you have all read so many books, you are full of knowledge of what other people have said, including the Gita, the Upanishads and all the rest of it. But you do not know what your own original thinking is because you are secondhand human beings, piled up with knowledge of other people and other things, and you don't know a thing for yourselves.

So here is a problem which we both share together and we have to find out the truth of the matter. One sees what is actually happening in the world, the division, the conflict, the contradiction, the political corruption. We do not have to go into all that because the description is never the described, and we are concerned not with the description but with what is described, with what is explained, which is "what is", and this thought has brought about, thought which is the response of memory, experience, knowledge.

Even those birds agree with us, if you are listening to those birds, and I hope you are, because listening to those birds completely, with complete attention, and hearing the beauty of a sound, not resisting it, not translating it into pleasure but merely listening to the beauty of a cuckoo or seeing the light of the sunset

on the palm trees, just to observe - from that observation we learn, and what we learn is not what other people have taught us.

We are saying that thought, your thinking, is the response of memory, the memory that you or your ancestors or race have accumulated through millennia. It is stored there consciously or unconsciously, and that storehouse is the brain, is the brain cells, you can observe it in yourself. It is much more important to learn about oneself by observing oneself, which is self-knowing; for when you begin to know yourself, wisdom comes from it, and also when you begin to know the whole structure of yourself, then sorrow ends. So you have to observe yourself, the way you talk, the words you use, your behaviour, then you will see that your own mind - which is also the brain cells - is the repository of all experience, not only personal, immediate experience but all the racial, the past experiences collected there. Those brain cells hold all the memory, conscious, hidden and open. And any response from that memory is thinking. If you had no memory, you would not be able to think at all. So thought is the response of the past, which is knowledge, and so thought can never be free, thought is always old. This is again an absolute fact.

And we try to solve all our problems, not technological problems, through the only instrument we think we have, which is, intellect, which is thought, and we also see that thought has divided people as the Hindu, the Muslim, the Christian and so on. Thought has done this, and thought not being able to solve this problem, this human problem of relationship, has constructed a super-ego the super Atman, which we think is going to solve our problem. But that idea of the super-self is part of thinking, and so thought, which

is time, which is the result of time, and the super-Atman, the Brahman, the soul, whatever you like to call it, is part of time and therefore not real. It is real only in the sense that thought has constructed it. So we have this problem now : that this world, the society, the culture, the human relationship, divisions - all this has been brought about by thought, by your thinking. I think that is obvious and real; it is not just a conclusion supported by facts and so on, but when one observes it, studies it, explores deeply - interested in this problem of human existence and human suffering, chaos, misery, in which man is caught - one can see that thought has brought about this division, conflict, misery. So thought as the intellect, however capable of reasoning, cannot possibly solve this problem.

Your thinking, however subtle, however shallow, is the result of the past. The past has been put together. What has been put together literally, horizontally or vertically, is time. Anything that has been put together demands time like any machine. Like the brain cells, all the collection of memories are the result of time, and we hope through time - which is thinking - to solve our human problems; and one can see that it can never be solved through thought, that thought is time,-that thought breeds fear and pleasure. Can thought - the everyday operation of thinking - can that solve any of our human problems? Obviously it cannot. So then, what else is there that can solve this? So to answer that question, one has to go into the problem of perception, seeing.

You know a mind is incapable of seeing clearly when it has any form of conclusion, prejudice. When you, as a Hindu or a Muslim or God knows what else, when you look at the whole world, this

world of existence, through a particular little hole called Hinduism, communism or what you will, how can you see the totality of anything? So one has to be free of this conditioning to understand this marvellous, complex human relationship. And one has to understand this principle of pleasure, because for most of us, however lofty our thinking may be - thinking that is the response of the past and therefore conditioned - most of our morality and activity and our search and our striving are based on the principle of pleasure, is it not? Observe it, you can see it for yourself. Our ambitions, the desire for success, the competitive pursuit, the aggression, the violence, the relationship between people, is based on this principle of pleasure, and without understanding pleasure and fear we shall never know what love is. A mind that perceives can understand what pleasure is, what fear is, what love is, and also that immense problem of death, and if there is a reality at all.

So you have to understand all this, and to understand it you must be able to perceive, to look, not through the eyes of another, not what the analysts or the psychologists or the professors or the philosophers say, but look with your own eyes.

So we have to examine what pleasure is, and that is a very important question, because if you understand it, in the understanding of that, you will understand what love is, if there is or if there is not something beyond the things that thoughts have put together. So let us briefly enquire together what pleasure is. Is pleasure love? Is pleasure desire? What is pleasure? Actually observe yourself, your own pleasures, observe your own pleasurable demands, observe the pursuits of your own pleasures. Watch them and find out, though the speaker is going to describe,

realize that the description is never the described, never. The word is never the thing. What is pleasure, which every human being pursues in most subtle forms and most crudely, sexually, in so many ways, what is that thing that man pursues endlessly? Have you observed when you see a lovely sunset, when the whole sky is filled with a roseate glow, as it is now in the west with the setting sun, you are experiencing a great delight, if you at all look and if you have the time to look?

That is an experience. That experience has given a great delight, and you pass on to other things, but the mind, the brain cells have registered that delight and there is the demand for the repetition of that delight. Please watch it in yourself, the repetition of that delight when you saw the sunset - it may have been two minutes ago - and you want that repeated, that is, the memory of that sunset has been registered and that thinking about the incident, the experience, the happening, that thinking about it gives a continuity to pleasure.

You have had sexual experience or other kinds of experiences, you think about it, you chew over it, image after image, which is thought thinking about a past event - pleasurable or painful - and it gives continuity to what is called pleasure. So thought creates both, gives continuity, nourishment to pleasure and to fear. That is - you have had pain, a physical discomfort, a suffering both physical and psychological. It has happened several days ago, last month or last week, and you think about it hoping that it will not happen again. So thinking about something, which you do not want to happen and may happen, is the beginning of fear.

So thought sustains pleasure and fear and, if you observe, joy,

ecstasy, an immense sense of delight has nothing whatsoever to do with thought. It happens when you are not occupied, when your whole mind is not chattering, suddenly you find there is a great sense of delight, of beauty and a great joy. Then thought comes along and says, "I would like that joy to be repeated", and then that joy which is so natural and unexpected becomes pleasure. So thought is the response of the past - memory which means thought - is the response of knowledge.

And there is the response, challenge of death, and you respond according to the memory of the known. The known is of yesterday, what you know, your experiences, the images of your family, the knowledge that you have accumulated, all that you have collected, that is the past. Therefore you are frightened of what may happen tomorrow, the unknown death. You see all this, you see how thought has divided people linguistically, nationally, racially, and thought pursuing everlastingly pleasure and always avoiding fear. You see all this, which is the result of thought, the result of both rational intelligence and irrational intelligence, the intellect - rational, capable, efficient - and the intellect also being irrational, neurotic, conditioned, illogical, has created not only the social structure with all its morality, with all its economic divisions, injustice, all that but also thought has created in us this battle, this everlasting conflict. So when you see all that and realize what thought has done, then what are you going to do?

What are you? You are educated - whatever that word may mean - which is merely cultivating a little corner of the vast field of existence. From that little corner you think you are going to solve all the problems, disregarding the rest of the field. I do not

know if you have observed it in yourself, and if you have not, do please observe it now. You have technological knowledge, you are living in a little corner, hoping to understand the whole field, and when you are functioning from a little corner, obviously you must live a life of contradiction. If you are a communist, if you are a Maoist, from that little corner you can only look at the world through Communist or Maoist eyes.

So one has to look at life with eyes that are not conditioned. And that is the whole problem - whether the mind with its brain cells can free itself completely from the past and look anew. Knowledge is necessary, otherwise you could not get from here to over there, you could not function, you could not get to be a good technician, you would not be able to talk English or Tamil or whatever you talk, you would not be able to recognize your wife or your friends. So knowledge is necessary but it becomes a total hindrance when thought, functioning from the past, which is, the past being the knowledge, operates. While seeing that knowledge with all its complexity is absolutely necessary to you as a scientist, as an engineer, that you cannot put knowledge aside and become a primitive and go back to tribalism, you also see that knowledge in human relationship creates conflict.

Look, it is very simple. If one is married or if one has a friend with whom one lives during a number of years or a few days or a few weeks, one has built an image of each other. You have put together an image about her or him. That image has been put together through various insults, pleasure, dominance, disregard - you know what relationship is especially between a husband and wife - you have an image of each other. That image is the past and

the understanding between those two images you call relationship - you leading your own private life and she leading her own private life, you with your ambitions and she with hers - and the past is preventing actual relationship. The past destroys all relationship, human relationship.

Now, having disowned the picture, knowing thought has its limited function, the question is, how can there be a radical, psychological change which is not touched by thought? Thought obviously cannot change the pattern which it has built or will build, because that is the past. So, is there a movement, a psychological movement, which is not of the past? Because you see, to find out if there is God or no God, if you would seriously give your heart and mind to find out totally if there is such a thing as God or not, you have to put aside all belief, you have to put aside totally every form of fear, every form of conflict, you have to totally understand what pleasure is. If you do not, you have no basis for order, because order is virtue. Virtue is not something you cultivate, not something that you practise. Order comes into being only when there is understanding of disorder, the disorder in which one lives, the actual disorder, the hypocrisy, the conflict, the agony, the despair, the confusion that one lives in. There is disorder, and when you begin to understand that disorder, not correct it, not say it must not be or must be, but what you actually observe in your daily life, out of that comes order, which is living.

When you have this absolute order which is righteousness, which is action, in which there is this sense of non-division, then you have the foundation for meditation, and then there is a possibility of finding out whether there is or there is not something

beyond time. Question: Is it possible to observe the psychological movement without thought, without the movement of thought?

Krishnamurti: Look, I want to know myself, I want to know what I am, not according to any religion, according to any teacher, any philosopher, any analyst or psychologist. I want to know myself as I am, not as I should be. So I have to look at myself, I have to look at myself as I am without any interpretation, without saying that it is good, it is bad, it is ugly, I must change, I must not change. I must look, I cannot change the sunset. I have to look, I cannot do anything about it. In the same way I have to watch myself, just observe.

Now, is that observation a movement of thought? That is, can thought look at the movement which thought has created - which is the "me"? The "me" is a bundle of memories, conditioned, put together through time, through experience, through knowledge; that "me" is the result of time, is the result of thought, whether that "me" is the super "me", the super - Atman moved to a higher level. All that is the "me", the "I", the ego, the self-centred activity. Now, can that be observed by thought, by the movement of thought, that which it has created? You understand the question?

Look, Sir, put it differently. I am all this bundle, collected through centuries upon centuries, which does not mean reincarnation. It has been collected through environment, through race, through knowledge, through time - evolved. Now that "me" is the observer, the censor, who says, "This is right, that is wrong, this should be done, this should not be done." That observer looks and what he looks at is the psychological movement of which he is a part. I don't know if you understand this.

Look, Sir, let us put it this way - one is envious. You know what it is to be envious - comparing yourself with somebody who has got more - that is envy. Now, there is that response which is verbalized, named as envy. At the moment of that response, when you are envious, there is no observer at all, there is only a state of envy. A few seconds later the observer comes along - which is the thinker - and says, "I should not be greedy", or gives explanations, reasons why he should not be greedy. So he separates himself from greed, so he becomes the censor, the observer, and then controls or suppresses or goes beyond the greed. So there is the observer and the observed. In that there is division; and that division is the source of all conflict, not only outwardly but inwardly.

Now, is there an observation without the observer? There is that palm tree. Can you look at it without the observer, the observer who names that as a palm tree - the observer of likes and dislikes - can you just look without the observer? You may be able to look at that palm tree objectively because it does not affect you. But can you look at your wife, at your husband, the man who insulted you, without the censor, just observe, without the past records? If you can so observe, then that observation is not the movement of thought.

Question: When you used the words "modern society is corrupt", your own mind has come to the conclusion and therefore it presupposes that society is corrupt. You have no right to make such an opinion.

Krishnamurti: Sir, I do not think it is an opinion, I do not think it is a conclusion. You observe this. You observe how man is confused, you observe the division in the world, you observe the

division between the communist and the capitalist, between the Catholic and the Protestant, the Hindu, the Muslim - you know the division. And this division does breed conflict, and that saying that division brings conflict is not a conclusion, it is a fact, as factual as this microphone is there. You have had two wars between the Muslim and Hindu. That is a fact. Division breeds antagonism, resistance, fight, conflict and when you observe this you say that division brings conflict. That is not a conclusion. You are merely stating a fact.

Question: Why do you talk at all?

Krishnamurti: I see, why do I talk at all? I really do not know. Sir, do you ask a flower, "Why do you flower?" Do not clap. Sir, do listen to it. This is not being clever. When you see something beautiful, do you say, "Why are you beautiful?" One talks generally with a motive, either to convert, or by addressing a large audience like this, one derives a great encouragement or terrible importance or derives from talking, a great deal of energy, as the politicians do. If there is a motive for talking, then you know it is exploitation. I have no motive for talking. If you want, listen; if you don't, don't. You neither encourage the speaker nor discourage. Take it or leave it. It is your life, your misery, your sorrow that we are concerned with and if you don't want to end your sorrow, your confusion, your agony, your torture of life, don't listen. Nobody is asking you to listen, forcing you to listen. This is not propaganda. We are concerned with changing "what is; and as you don't ask a flower why it blooms, don't ask the speaker why he speaks.

Question: Would you please talk or explain why there is so much difficulty in communication between individuals?

Krishnamurti: Sir, we are not individuals at all. We think we are individuals - that is merely a word, which has very little meaning. When you examine that word in the dictionary, not the opinion or theory of what an individual should be, you will find that it derives from the Latin word "indivisible" - not capable of being divided, broken up.

How can two human beings who are broken up in themselves communicate with each other, to "communicate" being to care, to co-operate, to work, to create together? There is a possibility of communication when both human beings share a common problem and are deeply concerned with the solution or the understanding of that problem. When you are deeply concerned, you can commune both verbally and non-verbally; but if one human being has certain opinions, conclusions, ideas and the other has opposing ideas, how can there be communication between the two? If you are a Hindu and I am a Muslim, how can we communicate? There is a possibility of communion only when you and I are both free of our petty little ambitions and tyrannies, that means when we are really individuals, indivisible. Then communion is possible. That means, when there is love between us - not opinion, not conclusions - when we really care dispassionately, intensely, then there is a possibility of communing with each other.

Question: How do you bring about order when there is so much disorder? How do you bring about an attitude which is indivisible, an attitude that is not broken up
Krishnamurti: First of all, do we know that we live a disorderly life? Do you know that you live a disorderly life, a contradictory life, a public life and a private life, wanting this and wanting that, having ideals there and living a life

without any meaning or relation to the ideal? You have the ideal of non-violence, and actually you are living a violent life. So this contradiction, this dual existence brings conflict, that is, disorder.

Are you aware of your life as disorder? Look at it, Sir, look at your own life and find out. You think one thing, say another, do another. This hypocritical existence, that is, having an ideal and living something entirely different from that ideal - that leads to hypocrisy, and that is disorder, isn't it? You see how silent you are? And you say, "You have just a theory." just listen to find out for yourself the truth of what is being said, or the falseness of what is being said. Find out, become aware of your disorder, the disorder of your life, not only outwardly but inwardly, and what has brought about this disorder - the cause.

Now when you say, "What has brought about this disorder," you are looking for a cause, aren't you? To analyse and to find out what the cause is takes time, doesn't it? I am in disorder and I want to find out how this has come into being. I know I can easily, very quickly find out the "why" of my culture, the society, the family, the tradition, the racial factors and all that - these are all the causes, the deeper causes. Now to examine all the causes which have brought about this disorder requires time, requires days, doesn't it? Do you see that, Sir? Now while you are examining, taking time to find out the cause, your life is still in disorder. So there is disorder and it is a waste of time, waste of energy, to find out what has brought this about.

What you can do is to observe that disorder, observe without trying to bring about order, without saying to yourself "I must bring order or I must suppress this disorder." just observe it, as you

have observed that sunset, and you cannot do anything about that sunset. In the same way, observe that disorder without any choice, be aware of the disorder; and you will see that you are really aware of it. Then out of that awareness comes an order, which is an extraordinary living thing. That order is not according to blueprint, it is not a mechanical order. Therefore, look at this disorder, listen to it, observe it in yourself, and the observer is the cause of disorder, the observer is part of that disorder. Therefore you must look without the observer, and then you will see what comes out of it.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 10

1ST PUBLIC TALK BANGALORE 30TH

JANUARY 1971

We have so many problems, such complex issues, that in order to understand them completely, one has to take a journey over the whole earth, see the various cultures objectively, sanely, rationally, and consider seriously the many conflicts: what actually is going on in the world, not only in the far world but also in this country. We must see actually, not theoretically, what is going on. We must see these conflicts as they are, not through the eyes of a Hindu, a communist or an extreme Maoist, we must be able to observe very clearly facts, not ideals, not what you think should be or what ought to be, but actually what is going on.

One has to observe what is happening in the world, the division, the conflict, the injustice, the wars, the national, linguistic, religious divisions, violence and immense sorrow. This is a fact, this one can observe, how religions have divided people, as the Hindu with his beliefs, the Christian with his doctrines, the Muslims with their faith. One can observe how religions, which are organized beliefs, propaganda, with their rituals, with their sacred books, with their teachers and saviours, have separated and brought about fragmentation in the human mind. Then there is division of nationality, the Indian, the Pakistani, the German, the Russian, Vietnamese, and so on; and there is the revolt of the young against the established order. In this country it has not taken a very violent form, but in other countries it is rampant there is a great deal of social injustice in this country, there is poverty, there is brutality,

violence. And when we observe all this rationally, without any prejudice. without coming to any conclusion, but just observing it, we see very clearly that human beings have created this monstrous, decadent, corrupt society, not only in this country but in the rest of the world. That again is a fact.

You are the world, the world is you. You are the society, the culture in which you have been born and brought up. That culture, that society is the result of your efforts, of your greed, your brutality, your violence. So you are the world, you are the community, you are the society, the culture. Do please realize that in this country where there is so much corruption, disorder, callousness, brutality, total indifference, you are responsible, each one, because you are India. You have brought about, put together through time the social structure with its divisions, you have put together the religions, the beliefs, the innumerable gods, and you have built this society. So the world is you and you are the world. Do realize this deeply, feel it with your heart, not with your petty little, cunning, insensitive mind, because that is the fact, and that fact is not a theory, is not an idea. The explanation is not the explained, the description is not what is described.

To bring about a vast, radical revolution - and that radical revolution is necessary not merely outwardly but in oneself unless you change, unless you cease completely to be a Hindu or a Buddhist or a Christian a Communist, merely bringing about a superficial reformation - altering a few patterns here and there, is not going to bring about peace to man at all. So it is your responsibility: it is the way you lead your life, the way you think, your activity, your daily corrupting ways, unless there is a

psychological, inward revolution in that, there is no possibility of really deep, profound, social changes.

One may, as one observes again, see what is happening - violence: though every religion has said, "Do not kill", "don't go to war", "don't hurt another", "be kind, generous, be tender, open your heart to another". The books have said it, but they have had no value at all. What is relevant is what you are. The world, the community, the society, the culture in which you have been brought up, are built through time by man. You are the result of that, and to bring about a change in the outward structure of the established, corrupt order, you must change yourself inwardly, completely. This is a logical, sane, observable fact.

Violence is considered as a means of changing society. It appears that through violence a quick change can be brought and therefore violence in certain parts of the world, as in this country, is justified. One can see that violence may bring about a superficial change in the social order, but that revolution, physical revolution, either invariably ends in dictatorship or bureaucracy or chaos, which in turn brings about tyranny. Again that is an observable fact.

So a man who is aware of all these facts takes only one resolution, which is that he, as a human being, who is the result of time, result of his environment, to bring about a change, must himself radically, deeply change.

So the question is, can this inward revolution, this psychological mutation actually take place now, and not in some distant future? We are going to investigate and see if there is a possibility of a total change in the very brain structure itself; and for this one must

share together the investigation, the enquiry. Communication means sharing together, thinking together, learning together, not agreeing or disagreeing. Both of us, both you and the speaker have to take the journey together. And communication means having something common between you and the speaker. That communication is not merely verbal. Of course, there must be a verbal understanding, that is, you understand English and the speaker understands English. But communication also means sharing, and you cannot possibly share if you remain with your particular prejudices, beliefs, dogmas, conclusions. So we are taking a journey together into the very complex problem of existence. We are going to enquire into human relationship. We are going to examine together this whole question of violence, understand together fear, pleasure, whether sorrow can ever end, what it means to love and what it means to die, and the beauty and truth of meditation, the quality of a mind that is truly religious. A mind that is crowded with the authority of others' experience is not a religious mind. A mind that is filled with the knowledge of what others have said is not a religious mind. The mind with beliefs, the mind that has dogmas, conclusions, that plays with rituals, is not a religious mind.

Part of investigation together is to listen together; but you cannot possibly listen if you are comparing what is being said with what you already know; you cannot possibly listen if you are agreeing or disagreeing. If you are merely listening to the words and not relating the words to the fact of yourself and if you are listening with your conclusions, with your hopes, with your problems, with your sorrows, with your agonies, then you are not

listening. Only by listening together shall we be able to solve all our problems completely, totally. So the mind that is capable of listening, not only to what the speaker is saying but also listening to the reactions, to the responses, to your own mutterings, will then share it, together. We are going to understand these immense, complex human problems, not how to change your government or how immediately to feed the poor, not how immediately to stop this appalling callousness and corruption, but by seeing the totality of the problem.

Life is not only going to the office but understanding yourself, your wife, your family, understanding this extraordinary thing called sex and human conflict, both within and without. It is understanding together whether it is at all possible to live at peace in this world, not in retirement, not by becoming a monk or a sannyasi, but how to live in this marvellous world which is ours.

No book can teach you about yourself, no Gita, no Upanishad, none of the professors, philosophers can teach you about yourself. What they can teach you is what they think you are or what they think you should be, that is, their opinion, which is not yours. You have for centuries upon centuries accepted the authority of others, of your guru, or your tradition, what other people have said and that is why you have no energy, that is why you are so dull, insensitive, that is why you are secondhand human beings.

So we are going to observe together what actually we have become, not what we should be, because there is no ideal, there is no goal, there is no purpose, but only "what is". If you have a goal, a purpose, an end, you are not capable of seeing actually what is going on. When you have an ideal of what you should be or what

you should become, or what you must be, then you create conflict between what you are and what you should be. It leads to hypocrisy and those who have ideals become hypocrites. You are hypocrites because you say one thing, do another, think another, and you talk everlastingly about ideals. So you have to put away from your mind totally this dualistic attitude of what you are and what you should be. The very essence of conflict is the division between the observer and the observed. A man who is concerned with truth has no ideals; for truth is in "what is" and going beyond it. So we must understand "what is", what we are.

What are we? What are you: Not according to any book, any authority, or any psychologist. If you say what you are according to them, you are repeating what they say, but you are not learning, you are not observing yourself. When you do observe yourself, when you are aware of yourself, you see that man throughout the world is caught up in pleasure and in fear.

You can observe that our religious, social structure and morality are all based on pleasure and fear. The fact is you are greedy, envious, acquisitive, fearful, ambitious, with an occasional flair of what you call love. One has to understand basically these two issues, fear and pleasure.

To understand means to be free, to be free to look, to observe what pleasure means, where it has led us, what is involved in it, how it has brought about the extraordinary division between the observer and the observed, the division into religions, into nationalities and so on, and to observe the fragmentation which has been brought about through pleasure. And also one must understand deeply, not verbally, not theoretically, the whole

complex question of fear. Where a mind is afraid, it cannot possibly see what truth is. It lives in darkness. Haven't you noticed for yourselves when you are afraid of your neighbour, of your government, of your wife, husband or the policeman, how dull your mind becomes, how incapable of thinking rationally the mind becomes? So, to understand fear and pleasure, one has to observe it in oneself.

We are together going to investigate these two issues upon which all our actions are based. They may be superficial actions, hidden actions, conscious or unconscious actions but all our motives are based on these two fundamental principles of pleasure and fear. When you say you are seeking truth, what you are seeking is the permanent establishment of the thing you call pleasure.

Observe it in your own life when the mind is frightened. Fear divides people. It makes people violent, disorderly. They may discipline themselves endlessly, but if there is fear, there is distortion, there is corruption, there is violence, there is mischief. The house is burning - not your particular little house - but the fire is in the world. There is destruction in the world, there is murder, chaos, and that house is burning.

So, when we are really profoundly serious, we are not concerned with how to avoid fear, run away from fear, suppress fear or overcome fear; not how to further pleasure or expand pleasure but understand them. To understand them you need a sensitive, observing, delicate mind, capable of looking; not coming to any conclusions, because a mind that has conclusions cannot function sanely.

Why has pleasure become so extraordinarily important? You know it expresses itself in so many subtle ways: self-importance, prestige, fame, success, knowledge, erudition, all that lies along the path of pleasure. Though you may go to temples and hear all the temple bells ringing, what you really worship is pleasure and money.

What is fear? Fear doesn't exist by itself. It exists in relation to something, to public opinion, what people might say about you. There is fear of death, there is fear of the unknown, there is fear of the known, fear of insecurity, fear of losing a job, fear of your wife who may do something which you oppose. Fear breeds violence. In a country that is becoming overpopulated, with every year more and more millions added, naturally there must be a growth of fear because of unemployment, lack of food, the insoluble poverty, the corrupt government. When you see all this, you are bound to be afraid not only for your own security but also for the security of the coming generations, your sons and your daughters. Somebody has hurt you and there is again fear in that hurt, and fear breeds violence. So unless you are really free of fear, you are bound to create chaos in the world, and fear cannot be suppressed by an ideal, by the ideal of courage.

You are afraid, and you have an idea that by developing courage you can get rid of fear, which is avoiding "what is", and hoping through courage to get rid of fear. So you have an ideal that acts as an impediment to the understanding of "what is". You as a human being are violent, aggressive. That is a fact and specially in this country for the last centuries upon centuries, you have had the ideal of non-violence. You are pursuing the ideal and in the

meantime you are sowing the seeds of violence. You say, "I am trying to be non-violent; I'll one day achieve a state in which there is non-violence, and therefore become a hypocrite. All idealists are essentially hypocrites. We are not dealing with the ideal of courage or how to get rid of fear or how to suppress it, but how to understand it. The moment you understand something, you are free of it.

Freedom does not come through ideals. Freedom and the beauty of freedom come when you understand actually "what is", when you really understand your own confusion, your own callousness, your own brutality. Out of that awareness, with care, with real attention, comes the beauty of that freedom.

So, what we need to do is to observe and learn and be aware of our own fear. We can only do that when it occurs; perhaps we can take a thing like attachment and observe.

You are all attached to your family, to your jobs, to your conclusions, aren't you? Watch what you are attached to, may be your wife, may be your children, or the things you have invented as gods. When you are attached to something, in that there is the desire to dominate, to hold, to possess, either the wife, the husband, the child, or an opinion or a judgement. So where there is attachment, there must be uncertainty. The attachment may die, or the person to whom you are attached may turn to another and there will be jealousy. Where there is attachment there must be fear. And being attached you say, "I must get detached", and you pursue detachment, and then you ask yourself, "how am I to be detached?" Then that becomes a problem. They will tell you, don't do this, do that, meditate and gradually get detached, become a saint.

Whereas, if you understood, observed the implications of attachment, you would see that there is fear. But instead of understanding fear, you cultivate detachment, which is deadly. When you cultivate detachment what takes place? You become callous, you become indifferent, you withdraw, you resist. You never look at the beauty of a tree or the sky or the lovely sunset because all that means attachment. So by your philosophy by your detachment you have become an ugly human being.

Look at your fear yourself, learn about it, the fact, not the cause of fear. What is fear? One is afraid of death. Let us take that as an instance. What is that fear of suddenly coming to an end, suddenly getting detached from your moorings. What causes fear? What is the process of fear? You had physical pain last year. You think about that pain, hoping that it won't come back again. Thinking about a past event, which has caused physical pain, results in not wanting it now or tomorrow. So thought is responsible for the continuity of fear.

I have done something wrong. It happened, let us say, yesterday or two weeks ago, and I am afraid that you might get to know it, So thought - thinking about the pain and thinking about what has happened - gives a continuity to fear. It is not a question of how to end fear but what gives continuity to fear. What happened two weeks ago is over, but the brain has recorded that pain, and thinking about it, is afraid that it might happen again.

One can easily observe and learn without being a specialist or a psychologist that thought, which is the response of memory, of an incident, physical or psychological, is recorded in the brain cells. The brain cells hold this memory and therefore the brain cells say,

"Be careful, do not have pain any more." Thought does not want it; therefore thought breeds fear.

Now what is pleasure? You see a beautiful tree or a lovely sunset with marvellous colours. You see on that pond the light of an evening or the morning, the beauty of it, the stillness of it, the extraordinary depth of light and shade - it happens, you are there - and you say how marvellous it is. The brain cells have recorded it, and the thought says, "I wish I could have that experience again tomorrow, it was so lovely, so beautiful, so enchanting." Thought gives continuity to an incident of a sunset and wants it repeated.

Yesterday you had sexual pleasure. That has been recorded and thought goes over it, thinks about it, chews the cud, builds images and thought says I must have it again. So thought breeds fear, and thought gives continuity to pleasure.

You must not have detachment from pleasure, not desirelessness. If you are seeking desirelessness as a way to truth, then you have a mind that is tortured, fighting your own instincts, your own demands, your own longings. Your mind becomes twisted, and a mind that is twisted cannot possibly see what truth is.

Then one asks what the function of thought is, knowing that fear and pleasure are the two sides of the same coin. What is thinking? Surely, thinking is a response of your collected experience, which is knowledge. If you had no knowledge at all, you could not think. If you had no knowledge of your name, or of language, you couldn't speak, you would be in a state of amnesia. So thinking is the response of collected memory, both of the particular human being and collective human beings, the tradition,

accumulated knowledge from which every thought is a response.

Then what is the function of thinking or thought? You must have knowledge: scientific, psychological, human knowledge, knowledge that is the accumulated experience of man, science, the experience of using words, how to play a piano and so on. You must have complete knowledge, you cannot do without technical knowledge.

And you also see what knowledge has done. You have accumulated knowledge as an as an experience of the thing that happened yesterday. You want that experience repeated and it may not happen, therefore there is pain. Knowledge is necessary in one direction, and knowledge breeds fear and pain in the other.

When you had that experience of sunset yesterday, it was new, fresh, full of joy, something incredible. The light, the texture, the feel of it that has been recorded, that has become knowledge, and therefore, that is already old. The old says "I must have new experience", and the new experience is translated in terms of pleasure.

So you see what thought does, that thought must function logically, sanely, effectively, objectively, in the technological world, and you also see the danger of thought.

The question arises: what is the entity that holds the thought, the thought as pleasure, as pain? What is it that holds this memory as a centre from which it operates? Have you observed that there is in you an observer and the thing observed? The observer is the censor, is the accumulated knowledge as a Christian, as a Hindu, as a Communist, and so on. The observer is the centre, he is the ego, the "me". That "me", that ego, invents a super-ego, the atman, but

it is still part of thought. So there is a duality in you as the observer and the observed, the "me" and the "you", we the Hindus and they, the Muslims. This division is the cause of all conflicts.

The observer is the holder of all memory from which all thought arises, so thought is never new. It is never free. It can think or invent freedom.

How does one observe without the observer, the observer being the past, the observer being the image? You have built up an image about your wife or husband through time - forty or ten years or one month or one day - that image has been built up. The image-maker is the observer, and we are asking, whether you can observe your wife, the tree, or the husband, without the image, without the observed. To find that out, you must find out the machinery of image-building. What is it that creates images? If you understand that, you will never create an image and you can observe the observer.

We are asking whether the image-maker, the machinery of this image-making, can ever come to an end. I will show you how it comes to an end. First of all, you have to enquire what is awareness, what it is to be aware, aware of the trees, of your neighbour, of the shape of the hall, aware of the colour of the various saris, shirts, aware outwardly and aware inwardly, to be aware choicelessly.

You insult me, and at that moment of insult, if there is total awareness, there is no recording, I do not want to hit you back I do not want to call you a name, I am passively aware of the insult or the flattery and therefore there is no image-making. Next time somebody insults you or flatters you, be totally aware, then you

will see that the old structure of the brain becomes quiet, doesn't instantly operate. The recording does not record, because you are totally aware. Please see this when you go out next time, look at a tree, just observe it, see the beauty of it, the branches of it, the strength of the trunk, the curve of the branch, the delicate leaves, the shape of it, without the image, the image being the previous knowledge of your having seen that tree. So you look at it without the observer, look at your wife or your husband, as though you are seeing her for the first time, that is, without the image. This seeing is true relationship, not the relationship between image and image. Therefore a mind that is capable of observing so clearly is capable of observing what truth is.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 11

2ND PUBLIC TALK BANGALORE 31ST

JANUARY 1971

What is important is that we should radically change our lives, not according to any particular plan or ideology, or to fit into some kind of utopia. When we see how extraordinarily violent, brutal and laden with an enormous amount of sorrow the world is, it obviously becomes the responsibility of each one of us to change our lives, the ways of our thinking, the ways of our behaviour, the attitudes and the impulses that we have. We are going to talk over together what actually life is and what love is and what the meaning of death is and find out for ourselves what a religious life is and whether such a religious life is compatible with the modern world. We are also going to talk over together what time and space are, and what meditation is.

There are so many things to talk over, and probably most of you have already acquired a great deal of knowledge about all these things, knowledge that others have given you, what your books, your gurus, your systems, your culture, have imposed upon you. That is not knowledge, that is merely a repetition of what other people have said, whether it is the greatest of teachers or your local guru. And in understanding daily life, we need not have any guru, any authority or teacher. All that we have to do is to observe, to be aware of what we are doing, what we are thinking, what our motives are, and whether it is at all possible totally to change our human ways, beliefs and despairs.

So first let us see actually what our life is - our daily life-

because if we do not understand it, if we do not bring order into it, if we merely slur over our daily activities, or escape into some ideology, or are just superficially be satisfied with things as they are, then we have no basis for a life, a way of thinking, a way of action, which will be right, which will be true. Order is virtue.

Without order one must live in confusion and without understanding that order, which is virtue, all morality becomes superficial, merely influenced by the environment, by the culture in which one lives.

One must find out for oneself what order is, whether this order is a pattern, a design, a thing that has been put together by man through various forms of compulsion, conformity and imitation, or whether order is a living thing and therefore can never possibly be made into a pattern, into a conformity.

What is our daily living? One can see that in that living there is a great deal of confusion, there is a great deal of conformity and contradiction, with every man at another man, with a business world where you are ready to cut one another's throats. Politically, sociologically and morally there is a great deal of confusion; and when you look at your own life, you see that the moment you are born till you die, it is a series of conflicts. Life has become a battlefield. And not being able to understand it, or resolve it, or go beyond it, we escape from it into some ideology, into the ideology of ancient philosophers, ancient teachers, ancient wisdom and we think by escaping from the actual we have solved everything. And that is why philosophy, ideals, all the various forms of networks of escape, have not in any way resolved our problems. We are just as we were five thousand years ago or more, dull, repetitive, bitter

angry, violent, aggressive, with an occasional flash of some beauty or happiness, and always frightened of that one thing which we call death.

Our daily life has no beauty, because again our religious teachers, our books have said, "Do not have any desires, be desireless, do not look at a woman as you might be tempted, and to find God, truth, you must be celibate." But our daily life is contrary to all the sayings of the teachers. We are actually what we are: very petty, small, narrow-minded, frightened human beings. Without changing that, any amount of your seeking truth or talking valiantly or most scholarly or interpreting your Gita and the innumerable books has no value at all. So you might just as well throw away all the sacred books and start all over again, because with their interpreters, their teachers their gurus, they have not brought enlightenment to you. Their authority, their compulsive discipline, their sanctions have no meaning at all. So is it possible to change our lives? Our lives are in disorder, our lives are in fragmentation. We are one thing at the office, another while going to the temple, entirely different in the family, and in front of a big official you become a frightened, sycophantic human being. Without changing our daily life, our asking, what truth is, whether there is a God or not, has no meaning whatsoever. We are fragmented human beings - broken up - and till we are a total human entity, whole, complete. there is no possibility of coming upon that something which is timeless.

So first we must look at our lives. That is, we must observe. Now what does that word "observe" mean? There is the sensory perception with the eye: you see this bougainvillaea. then as you

observe that colour, you have an image, you make an image. You have already an image; you have a name for it. You like or dislike it, you have a preference through the image you see. So you do not actually see. We not only look at nature with the eyes that have accumulated knowledge about nature and therefore with an image, but we also look at human beings with our various forms of conclusions, opinions, judgements and values. So when you look, when you observe yourself, your life, you observe it through the image, through the conclusions that you have already formed. You say this is good or this is bad, or this should be and that should not be. You are not actually looking at life. So when you are doing that you are not directly in relationship with what you see. You see that you are looking with your past knowledge, with all the images, the tradition, the accumulation of all human experiences which prevents you from looking. This is a fact which must be realized that actually to observe your life you must look at it afresh, that is, look at it without any condemnation, without any ideal, without any desire to suppress it or change it, just observe. Are you doing this? Are you using the speaker as a mirror in which you are seeing your own life? And because you are seeing it with eyes of conclusions, it prevents you from looking at it directly, being in contact with it. Are you doing it?

Look at the sky, look at that tree, look at the beauty of the light, look at the clouds with their curves, with their delicacy. If you look at them without any image, you have understood your own life. But you are looking at yourself, at your life as an observer and your life as something to be observed, there is a division between the observer and the observed. This division is the essence of all

conflict, essence of all the struggle, pain, fear, despair.

Where there is a division between human beings, division of nationalities, division of religion, social division, wherever there is a division, there must be conflict. There is Pakistan on one side and India on the other battling with each other. You are a Brahmin and another is a non-Brahmin, and there is hate, division. Now, that externalized division with all its conflict is the same as the inward division, as the observer the observed.

A mind that is in conflict cannot possibly ever understand what truth is. A mind in conflict is a tortured mind, a twisted mind. How can it be free to observe the beauty of the earth or a child or a beautiful woman or man or the beauty of extreme sensitivity and all that is involved in it?

Now, we are going to find out for ourselves - not from the speaker - whether it is possible to end this division between the observer and the observed. Are you following all this? Please, this is important if you are really to move any further. You are going to go into the question of what love is, what death is, what the beauty of truth is, what meditation is, and a mind that is completely and totally still; and to understand all this, one must begin with the ending of conflict, and this conflict exists wherever there is the observer and the observed.

The next question is: what is this observer, the observer who has separated himself from the observed? We see that when we are angry, at the moment of anger, there is no observer. At the moment of experiencing anything there is no observer. When you look at a sunset, that sunset is something immense, when you look at it, there is no observer saying, "I am seeing the sunset." A second

later comes the observer. Supposing you are angry, at the moment of anger there is no observer, no experiencer, there is only a state of anger. A second later comes the observer who says, "I should not have been angry", or "I was justified in getting angry". This is the beginning of division. How does this happen? Why, at the moment of experience, is there a total absence of the observer, and how does it happen that a second later the observer comes into being? When you look at this flower, at the moment you observe it closely, there is no observer, there is only a looking. Then you begin to name the flower. Then you say, "I wish I had it in my garden or in my house," then you have already begun to build an image about that flower. The image and the image-maker are the observer, and the observer is the past, the "me" as the observer is the past, the "me" is the knowledge which I have accumulated, the knowledge of pain, sorrow, agony, suffering, despair, loneliness, jealousy. The observer looks at that flower with the eyes of the past. You do not know how to look without the observer and therefore you bring about conflict.

Now our question is, can you look not only at the flower but at your life, at your agony, at your despair, at your sorrow, without naming it, without saying to yourself, "I must go beyond it, I must suppress it"? Can you look at it without the observer? Take your particular form or particular tendency, or take what most people are: envious. You know what envy is. You are very familiar with that. Envy is comparison, the measurement of thought, a comparing of what you are with what you should be or what you would like to become. When you are envious of your neighbour - he has got a bigger car, a better house and all the rest of it - you

certainly feel envy, that is, you compare yourself with him and envy him more. Now can you look at that feeling without saying it is right or wrong, without naming it? Can you look at it without an image? Then you go beyond it. Instead of struggling with envy and trying to suppress it, observe your anger, your envy, without naming it.

The naming is the movement of the past memory while it justifies or condemns. If you can look at it without naming, then you will see you go beyond it.

The moment you know the possibility of going beyond "what is", you are full of energy. The man who does not know how to go beyond "what is", because he does not know how to deal with it, is afraid, he wants to escape. Such a person loses energy. If you have a problem and you can solve it, then you have energy. A man who has a thousand problems and does not know what to do with them, loses his energy. So in the same way, look at your life, in which there is what you call love.

What is love? We are not discussing the theories of what love should be. We are observing what we call love. Is love pleasure? Is love jealousy? Can a man who is ambitious, love? Can a man who is competitive love? - and you are all competitive. You want a better job, better position, better house, an image of yourself. Can you love when you go through all this tyranny, when you dominate your husband, your wife, your children? When you are seeking power, is there a possibility of love?

In negating what is not love, there is love, You have to negate everything which is not love, that is, no ambition, no competition, no aggression, no violence either in speech, in act or in thought.

When you negate that which is not love, then you know what love is. And love is something that is intense, that you feel strongly, love is not pleasure. Therefore one must understand pleasure, and not attempt to love somebody.

When you see what your life is, there is no love in it, there is no beauty, there is no freedom, and actually how barren your life is, you ought to shed tears.

This barren life is the result of your culture, of your sacred books, because they have said, "Do not look at the sky because there is beauty, and that beauty might be transferred to the woman. If you are to be a religious man, withdraw from the world, deny the world, the world is a Maya, an illusion, escape from it", and you have escaped from it because your life shows it.

If you observe your life, you can find out for yourself what love is, because in that lies great passion. The root meaning of that word "passion" is sorrow. Do you know what it means to suffer, not how to escape from suffering, or what to do about suffering, but to suffer, to have great pain inwardly? When there is no movement of escape from that sorrow, out of that comes great passion, which is compassion.

You must also find out what death is, not at the last minute, not when you are sick, unconscious, diseased, incapable of clarity - that happens to everybody: old age, disease and death - but while you are young, fresh, active, while you are going to an office every day returning to your particular little prison of a family.

The organism could last longer, depending on the kind of life one leads. If one's life is a battlefield from the moment one is born till one dies, then one's body is worn out quicker. The heart goes

through tension. This is an established fact. To find out what death is there must be no fear, and most of us are frightened of death, frightened of leaving the things that we have known, frightened of leaving our family, frightened of letting go the things that we have accumulated, of leaving our knowledge, our books. Not knowing what is going to happen when we die, the mind - that is thought - says there must be a different kind of life. Life must continue somehow, your individual life. Then you have the whole structure of belief - reincarnation. What is it that is to be reborn in the next life, all the accumulations of your knowledge, all your thoughts, all the activities, all the goodness or the evil or the ugly things that you have done? If you really believe in all this karma, then what matters is what you do now, how you behave now, because in your next life you are going to pay for it.

So if you are really caught in the network of this belief, then you must pay complete attention to your life now. To find out what it means to die, not physically - that is inevitable but to die to everything that is known, to die to your family, to your attachment, to all the things that you have accumulated, the known pleasures, the known fears, every minute, will show you a mind made young, fresh, and therefore innocent. So there is incarnation of the next life the next day. To incarnate the next day is far more important than in the future. This will give you a mind that is astonishingly innocent. The word "innocence, means a mind that is incapable of being hurt. Therefore, a mind that is being hurt must die to the hurt every day, so that it comes the next morning with a fresh, clear, unspotted mind which has no scar. That is the way to live.

A mind that is without effort - you have understood how effort

comes into being when there is conflict, conflict between the observer and the observed - such a mind brings order. Order comes when you have understood what disorder is. When you understand it, not intellectually but actually, out of that comes order, and that order is virtue, that order is rectitude, that order is a living thing.

A man who is vain tries-to become humble, to have humility. In that attempt to become humble there is a conflict, whereas if I face the fact that I am vain - and to understand that and go beyond it, there must be understanding of oneself completely - there must be this order which is not habit, which is not practice, which is not the cultivation of some virtue.

Virtue comes into being like a flower of goodness, when you understand. Then you can begin to enquire what it is that man has sought throughout the centuries. He has been asking for it, trying to discover it. You cannot possibly understand it or come upon it if you have not laid the foundation in your daily life. And then we can ask what meditation is, not how to meditate or what steps to take to meditate, or what systems and methods to follow to meditate. All systems, all methods make the mind mechanical. If I follow a particular system, however carefully worked out by the greatest guru you can possibly imagine, that system, that method makes the mind mechanical, and a mechanical mind is a dead mind.

"Tell me how to meditate", that is your first question, "because if you will tell me, I will practice it and do it day after day, I will get up early morning, and repeat, repeat." You know what kind of mind you will have at the end of a year - a dull, stupid mind, a mind that can escape, that can hypnotize itself. And that is not

meditation.

Meditation is a marvellous thing, if you know the meaning of a mind that is "in meditation", and not "how to meditate". We will see what meditation is not, then we will know what meditation is. Through negation you come upon the positive, but if you pursue the positive, it leads you to a dead end. We say meditation is not the practice of any system. Machines can do that. So systems cannot reveal the beauty and the depth and the marvellous thing called meditation.

Nor is meditation concentration. When you concentrate or attempt to concentrate, in that concentration there is the observer and the observed, there is the one who says, "I must concentrate, I must force myself to concentrate", and concentration becomes conflict. When you do learn to concentrate like a schoolboy, that concentration becomes a process of exclusion, a building of walls against thought and movement of thoughts.

There must be complete self-knowledge. So there must be no system, no method, no concentration - and a mind that has understood all this through negation, such a mind then becomes naturally very quiet. In this, there is no observer who has achieved some kind of silence. In this silence there is the emptying of the mind of all the past. Unless you do this in your daily life, you won't understand the marvellous beauty, the subtlety of it.

When the mind has complete order, mathematical order, and when that order has come into being naturally, through the understanding of the disorder in your daily life, then the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet. This quiet has vast space, not the quiet of a little room. It is not the quiet or the silence of the ending

of noise. A mind that has understood the whole problem of existence - love, death, living, beauty - when you have understood all this, then you will know what happens in that silence. Nobody can describe it. Anybody who describes it does not know what it is. It is for you to find out.

It is right to ask questions. You must ask questions, not only of the speaker but of yourselves. It is far more important to ask yourselves why you believe, why you follow, why you accept authority, why you are corrupt, why you get angry, jealous. Question those, and find out the answer.

Sirs, you have to stand alone, completely alone, which does not mean you become isolated. If you are alone, then you will know what it means to live purely. Therefore you must ask questions endlessly of yourselves. The more you ask yourselves, not find an answer but to ask and look, the more you understand. When you ask there must be care, love in your asking; and do not beat yourselves with questions.

Question: When you say "The one who says he knows does not know", what do you mean by that? Must you not know yourself to say that? Krishnamurti: You have to find out what the word know, means, what is involved in the word "know". When you say "I know" my wife or my husband, what do you mean by that word? Do you know her, or do you know him, or do you know the image that you have about her? The image you have about her is the past. So to know is to know something that is over, something that is gone, something that you have experienced. Now when you say "I know", you are looking at the present with the knowledge of the past.

Now I want to know myself, understand myself, myself which is a very living thing. It is not a static thing, it is changing all the time, adding, subtracting, taking on, putting off.....I must come to it each time as though I am learning about it for the first time. I look at myself, and in looking at myself I find I am ugly, or extraordinarily sensitive, or this or that. And translating what I am looking at becomes the knowledge, and with that knowledge I look at myself next minute. So what I see will not be fresh, it will be with the eyes of the known. So to learn about myself there must be the ending of knowing myself each time, so that each time I am learning, there is a learning about myself afresh.

Now the one who says he knows does not know. Have you understood now? The man who says, "I have experienced God; I know what it means to be enlightened", means simply, "I know the way to the station", because the station is a fixed place. There are many paths to the station, there are many gurus for each path and they all say, "We know, we have experienced" - which means what? They have known something, and hold on to something that has been experienced, dead.

There is no path to truth, because truth is a living thing, it is not a fixed, static, dead thing. Like you, Sir, what are you? Are you static? Aren't you changing every day, for worse or better? So I can never say I know you. It is a most stupid form of saying "I know". It is a kind of consolation, it is a kind of security for myself.

When you understand this one question completely, you have understood so many things. So distrust any man who says "I know", any man who says, "I will lead you to enlighten- ment; do these things and you will achieve." Have nothing to do with such

people, they are dead people, because they are living in the past, with things they do not know - enlightenment, truth. Truth is a timeless state, you cannot come by it through time.

Knowledge is time. So, as we said, die to every knowledge that you have every day. Die, and be fresh next morning. Such a mind never says "I know", because it is always flowering, it is always new.

Question: You do not want us to read Ramayana, the Mahabharata, the great epics. What is wrong with them? Why are you so hostile towards our great saints?

Krishnamurti: First of all, I do not know your great saints. I do not want to know them. I do not see the point of knowing them. They are probably conditioned by their culture, by their society, by the religion they are born in. If I want to know, I want to learn about myself, not about them. A Christian saint is not accepted here as a saint. Will you as a Hindu, accept a Christian saint as your saint? Of course not. Your saints are conditioned by the culture in which they have lived. I am not hostile to them. I am just stating facts. They are tortured human beings, they detach themselves, or they are tremendously devoted to God (whatever that word may mean), to their visions, to their own ideas, to their own culture which has brought them to believe in God. If they were born in Communist Russia, they won't believe. There they would be no saints, they will be Marxists.

Now, Sir, I do not read Mahabharata, Ramayana and Gita, I do not read these books. Why do you read them? Do you read them for literature, for the beauty of the language, or do you read them as sacred thing, to be read in order to achieve Nirvana or heaven or

whatever it is? Why do you read them?

Question: Mahatma Gandhi read the Gita, and he was a great man.

Krishnamurti: The gentleman says Mahatma Gandhi, and the greatest men have read the Gita, and so on. I do not know why you call them great. Because they have read the Gita? You call them great because they fit into your pattern.

Question: No, for the love of mankind.

Krishnamurti: For the love of mankind? They loved mankind and therefore you love them? Which means you love mankind? No, Sir, be honest about all these things.

If you read the book of yourself - you understand, Sir? - the book of yourself, that is far more important than any other book, because your book, the book which is you, contains the whole of mankind - all the agonies it has been through, the misery, the love, the pain, the joy, the suffering, the anxiety. There is a book in you, and you go and waste your time reading somebody else's book. And that you call love of mankind.

Question: What is the reason for the grievances that sex has brought to the world in spite of the fact that it is the greatest energy of man.

Krishnamurti: Have you noticed throughout the world, and therefore in your own life, how sex has become extraordinarily important? Have you noticed it? You are all very strangely silent. Talk about Ramayana and Gita, and you burst with energy. Talk about your daily life, you subside. Why has sex - the act, the pleasure - why has that become such a colossal thing in your life? - not only in your life but the life of everybody? In the west they put

it out, open. Here they all hide it, they are ashamed of it. You are embarrassed, you are shy, you are nervous, guilty - which all shows that it has become tremendously important in your life. Why?

Intellectually you have no energy, because you repeat what others have said, you are prisoners to theories, to speculations, and therefore you have no capacity to reason, to observe. You have got mechanical minds, you go to schools where you mug up facts and repeat the facts. And your life, the daily life, going to the office day after day is a mechanical life.

So there is no intellectual freedom; and freedom means energy, vitality, intensity, because that gives you a tremendous energy. And that you deny totally because you accept authority, not only the authority of the professor but the authority of your spiritual leaders, and they are not spiritual when they become your leaders. So you are not free intellectually; and emotionally you are sentimental, devoted to some god, some person. That does not give you energy, because in that there is fear. Energy comes only when you completely lose yourself, when there is total absence of yourself, and that takes place when you have sex. For a second everything ends. And you have the pleasure of it. Then thought picks it up, images - wanting it more and more - repetition. Therefore, that becomes the extraordinarily important factor in your life, because you have nothing else. You are confused, miserable, unhappy human beings. You are not intense, you have no passion, intellectually, to stand alone, to see clearly and stand by it. You are frightened; and what have you left? - sex.

All your religions say do not have sex. So you battle. "To find

God you must not have sex." And you try not to be sexual. Full of sex, you battle with yourself. The more you battle, the more important it becomes.

So you see your life, what it is. You have no love, but pleasure. And when you have pleasure, you are frightened of losing it. Therefore, you are never free, though you may write volumes about freedom. So, when you understand all this - not intellectually, but daily in your life - you will see what you have reduced mankind to through your Mahabharatas, Gitas and gurus. You will see that you have reduced yourself to a mechanical entity, an unhappy, shoddy little entity; and with this little mind you want to capture the vast timeless space of truth.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 12

1ST PUBLIC TALK BOMBAY 7TH FEBRUARY

1971

I think one should have a good look at not only what is going on in the world, but also more rigorously look at ourselves. To look clearly without any distortion, there must be a quality of perception, a quality of mind that sees, not resisting, not prejudiced, not caught in any particular formula, but which merely observes. And in perceiving "what is" actually, not theoretically, we shall come upon what is truth. Therefore it is very important to understand the word "perception", the seeing, because we are going to go into the very complex problem of living, not merely outwardly but inwardly, and one must be very capable of looking at exactly what is going on. To perceive "what is", is the basis of truth, and you cannot possibly perceive or see if you are bigoted, narrow, frightened, or belonging to any particular sect, group or community.

So what we are going to do is together observe, together find out, not only how to bring about a radical revolution in ourselves and therefore in society, but also find out for ourselves a way of living in which there will be no conflict whatsoever. And to understand all this, to understand our sorrows, our confusion, our great many contradictory way of thought and activities, we have to look, we have to see exactly what is going on, not interpret it, not try to translate it, not try to escape from it, nor translate it according to our particular like and dislike, but observe and that is where it is going to be difficult - to see exactly what is going on.

What we are going to talk about during these four meetings here, is not a question of agreement or disagreement. We are both of us, going to observe, understand together the immense problem of living, of existence, which is, understand together your life, your problems, the complex relationship between man and man, because without laying the right foundation in relationship, in our daily relationship with other human beings, without having a right basis, we cannot possibly go beyond. As men who are really serious, you must inevitably lay the foundation of understanding, of relationship between man and man, not based on an idea or conclusion or the authority of your scriptures or your gurus, but what you yourselves understand as the meaning and the significance of relationship.

Now you know what is happening in the world, not only in the faraway world of America or Russia or China, but also near at home. There are wars, there are riots, there is despair, great sorrow, confusion, a fragmentation which is going on, fragmentation not only nationally, religiously but also inwardly in ourselves. If you observe yourself, you will see how contradictory you are. You say one thing, you think another, do something else. Nationally, you are divided: the Hindu and the Muslim, Pakistan and India, Germany, Russia and America. You know the division - political, national divisions with all their conflicts, with all their ambitions, competition. If you observe you will see there is the Catholic and Protestant, the Hindu and the Muslim, the Buddhist and somebody else. The world around us is broken up, fragmented socially, morally and ethically. Both outwardly and inwardly we are fragmented people, broken up. And when there is division of any kind, there must be conflict, as between Pakistan and India, the

Hindu and the Muslim, between ourselves the observer and ourselves the observed, and between the thinker and the thought. So where there is division there must be conflict. And a mind in conflict must inevitably be distorted, and therefore it cannot possibly see clearly what truth is.

So there is this fact that human beings right throughout the world have created a society, a culture, a morality that is no longer moral, a culture that is corrupt, a society that is disintegrating. Again this is a fact with which you can neither agree or disagree, because it is so. And you observe in this country what is going on: the decadence, the immorality of society, the various divisions - linguistic, tribal, religious. If you observe very closely and clearly, you see you have thousands of gurus, each having his system, his method to truth, to enlightenment, to bliss. If you observe closely again, you see how tradition has distorted your minds, how you accept the religious books as though they were complete truth. Now these are all facts: that there is a division, that the very fact that religion should bring people together has brought about division, separation, conflict, misery.

Now seeing all this, not from the description of the speaker but actually seeing it in your own life, what can you do, what is the right action? There is this great sorrow, misery, poverty in the world. Seeing this, not only outwardly but inwardly, that inwardly we are contradictory, inwardly there is division, there is a struggle, what can one as a human being do? Because you are the world and the world is you. You are the result of your culture, of your society, of your religion; and the society, the culture which you have built, in that you have been nurtured, and therefore you are part of that,

you are not separate from the culture, from the society, from the community. Again this is a fact - you or the majority of you probably believe in God. I do not know why, but you do. Because you have been brought up in a society, in a culture that believes in God; and if you are born in Russia or in a communist society, you would not believe in God. There you would be conditioned not to believe, as you are conditioned here to believe. You are following all this?

So you are the result of the society in which you live and that society you have made, your grandfathers, the past generations have made it. So you, as a human being, facing all this, of which you are a part, you must inevitably ask what is one to do and what is the right action.

First of all, can you as a human being follow what another says? You understand the question? We need a total change, a deep, psychological revolution, the inward revolution, without which you cannot possibly create a new society. You are really interested in being told what you should do. You are really interested in finding a safe path, because you have never exercised your own brain to find out how to live rightly. You repeat, and from now on if there is one thing that you can really do, it is never to repeat what you do not know, never to do anything that you do not understand but only what you yourself understand. You know what would happen to you? You would no longer be secondhand human beings. Then you would put aside all the gurus, all the religious books, you would never follow anybody. Because then you would be acting with facts, not with suppositions, not with formulas. Do try it, do it one day, never to repeat anything which you do not understand

logically, sanely, never to do something that you yourself have not directly tested. Then you will see that you would be faced with actualities, not with ideals, not with formulas, not with conclusions, but actually with "what is, which is yourself.

So when you see all this, how you a human being living in this country, supposed to be very spiritual because there are so many gurus, when you see all the contradictions in yourselves and in the world, when you observe in yourself the great sorrow that you have, the despair, the agony, the suffering, the loneliness, the utter lack of love, the callousness, the brutality, the violence, then you ask what are you to do. The question what to do is not important at all. What is important is how you observe these facts, how you look at these facts, how you as a human being look at this tremendously complex problem of existence, the complex society, the immorality of this present structure of society.

You cannot act before you have understood, before you have seen. So first you must see, you must observe, you must perceive. Now, how do you perceive? If you look at the world as a Hindu, then you are not looking at the facts, but you are looking with the prejudice of a Hindu, therefore you are incapable of looking. Right? If I look at the world as a communist, I am only looking at the world from a particular point of view, from a particular conclusion. Therefore I am incapable of looking at this immense problem. If I am a Muslim and I look at this extraordinary thing called living from a particular narrow point of view as a Muslim or a Hindu or a Buddhist, I cannot possibly see the extraordinary beauty of life with its complexity. So how do you look at this? Do you look at it from your traditional point of view or do you look at

it as a scientist, as an engineer, or a follower of a particular sect, how do you look at it? You see the absurdity of being a Hindu. When the house is burning, the whole world is burning, you want to put the fire out as a Hindu or as a Muslim, Parsee, God knows what else.

So what is most important before you say "What can I do as a human being with regard to this madness that exists in the world?" You must understand what it means to look, to look at the world. In looking at this whole problem of existence, you drop away all division, you are concerned with the understanding of the problem, not as a Hindu. You have understood? If you don't, you are going to remain a Hindu, a Parsee, a Buddhist, a follower of some guru, because in that way you maintain division; therefore you maintain conflict. Therefore, where there is conflict, there must be pain, suffering and in that there is no love. Right, is this clear? Verbally at least? That is, intellectually you may observe this fact, intellectually, verbally, you may say "I understand that division in any form must bring about misery", but intellectual comprehension does not do anything. Intellectually saying, "I agree with that or disagree with that" has no meaning, but to see the truth that any division must inevitably bring about conflict, if you really see it, then action follows. Then you are concerned to eliminate in yourself and in the society every form of division.

Look, Sir, in you, when you observe yourself, there is the observer and the observed - isn't there? - you the censor and the thing that is condemned or justified. If you look at the world as an observer or look at yourself condemning, justifying, explaining, in that there is division, and therefore conflict, and therefore misery.

So, is it possible to observe, to perceive without the observer? You understand my question?

The observer, the thinker, the entity that perceives is the result of the past. You who observe your anger, your jealousy, your ambition, your desire to succeed, and all the rest of it, you who are struggling are the result of the past. The past is the observer, the me. Now, can you look without the observer, that is, without the past? When you are angry, at the moment of anger or jealousy or envy, at that precise moment there is no observer. The observer comes in a little later. Then he either condemns anger or accepts it. So the observer is the past, the observer is the censor.

Now can you look at this vast field of life without the observer? Then only you will see the totality of life. Now I am going to show it to you. We will begin with the simplest thing. When you look at a tree, how do you look at it, how do you see it? You see it, not only with sensory perception, but also you see it with your mind. Your mind has created the image of the tree. You say, "That is a palm tree, that is a mango tree." So your knowledge of the tree, which is the past, interferes from looking at the tree. Right? This is very simple. Knowledge of the tree prevents you from looking at the tree. Looking at the tree means to be in contact with it, not identifying with the tree but to observe it completely and you cannot observe it completely if the past interferes. Do you see that?

The next step is to observe yourself in relation with another. You can observe the tree very easily because it does not interfere with your happiness, with your desires, all the rest of it. It is purely a tree, objective. So if you do not understand how to look at a tree, without naming the tree, without the knowledge of the tree, the

botanical knowledge - which is all the past - then you cannot possibly see the beauty, the truth, the wholeness of the tree.

The next step is to look at your wife, your husband or your friend without the observer, that is, without the image that you have created about your wife or your friend. You are following all this? Because all this is going to lead to an action in which there is not a sense of contradiction, to an action that will be total, complete and unless you understand this, your action will inevitably be contradictory and therefore conflicting. So you have an image about your wife and she has an image about your friend and your friend has an image about you. That is obvious.

Now, how are these images formed? What is the mechanism of this image-building? You have an image about your wife or your husband. That image has been built through many years or through one day. You have an image of your wife giving you sexual pleasures, the nagging, the brutality - you know all that goes on between husband and wife - the domination, the bullying, the irritation. You know much better than I do what goes on. How are these images formed? Please observe this within yourself, do not bother with the explanation that the speaker gives, but watch it in yourself, use the speaker as a mirror in which you are seeing yourself.

The brain cells are recording all the time, every incident, every influence. It is a recording machine. When the wife nags you, it is recorded; when you demand something of her and she gets angry, that is recorded. So the brain is a machine that is recording all the time consciously. Right? You do not have to study biology or psychology or any scientific book if you can observe yourself. You

have the marvellous book of yourself in which you can learn infinitely. So when you, through years or through days have recorded these memories, these memories are the images. She has her image and you have your image about her. The relationship between these two images is what you call husband and wife. Right? Therefore it is not relationship at all. Relationship means direct contact, direct perception, direct understanding, sharing together. See how the machinery comes into operation, that is, when you get angry with your wife or when she nags you, the image is formed immediately, and that image is stored up, gets stronger and stronger, and that image is the factor of division. Therefore there is conflict between you and her.

Now, can this machinery, the building of the image come to an end, so that you are really in contact with the world, not through an idea? When there is an image about the world or about yourself or about your neighbour, your wife, there must be division. The image is not only anger and nagging, but formulas, concepts, beliefs. When you say, "I am an Indian", that is an image. That image divides when another person says, "I am a Muslim, I am a Pakistani." You follow? This image is not merely between two people but also between these formulas that have created these images. So you see that belief divides people. You believe in God, or you believe in reincarnation and somebody believes quite the opposite - which are all images. So images, formulas, concepts, beliefs, divide people. And that is the basic reason for conflict outwardly and inwardly. Do you understand this - not intellectually up here but in your heart? Then you will do something when it is real, when you see the truth of it, and beauty of it, then you will act

entirely differently.

So our question is, how are these images formed and can the image-building come to an end? I have shown you how they are formed, that the brain which has so many other faculties, which is capable of such extraordinary things - going to the moon, inventing extraordinary technological things - this very brain has the quality of recording every instinct, every hurt, every flattery, every nuance of every action. Now, can this recording take place without interfering with action? You have understood this question? See first the logic and you will see the beauty of it afterwards.

You have insulted me or flattered me. The person who has insulted me, I have an image about that person, I do not like him; but the man who has flattered me, I like him, he is my friend, the image has been formed instantly. Now, can this forming of image come to an end instantly? Not afterwards, because once it is formed it is difficult to get rid of it. I am going to go into both: the prevention and the cure.

First of all, the prevention, which is never to form an image about anything. When you insult me, at that moment, to be totally aware - you understand? So one must understand what it means to be totally attentive at the moment of insult, at the moment of flattery. What does it mean to be aware, to be aware of the colours of the various saris, dresses about you objectively, outwardly? When you are aware of blue, red or pink, whatever the colours are, and say, "I do not like it, I like it", you are limiting the awareness. To be aware without limitation of like or dislike, condemning or justifying, is to be aware without any motive, without any choice, so that you are aware of the whole thing. Right? Now when you are

insulted or flattered, at that moment if you give complete attention, which is complete awareness, then you will see that there is no image forming at all. Because what takes place then? Attention means there is no observer at all, there is no censor who says "I like, I dislike." You are merely attentive. Right?

Attention is not concentration - I won't go into the whole problem of concentration. When you are so attentive, in which there is no choice, in which there is no observer, then there is no image-making at all. Now, please just listen. Are you attentive totally to what is being said? Are you listening with complete attention, or are you listening partially? Or are you listening completely, with your heart, with your mind, with your nerve, with your whole organism, psychosomatically, completely? Then if you are so listening, you will see you have no image of the speaker at all. You understand? Now when the next time your wife or your friend says something pleasant or unpleasant, give complete attention to it, so prevent the image forming, because the mind then becomes free.

Freedom means seeing things clearly, purely, without any distortion. It is only such a mind that can see the truth, not the images that you have built about truth. So that is one thing you can do instantly.

Then what will you do with all the images. that you have collected about your country, about your leaders - political, religious - about your theories? You know how your mind is burdened with formulas, theories, opinions, judgments. What will you do about them? You see, you have not gone into it, you have not thought about any of these things at all. You will read the Gita,

the Upanishads or repeat or go to some meetings where commentaries are made on the Gita and the Upanishads. just think of spending your lives on somebody else's words. Now what will you do with all the collection of images, beliefs, formulas, what will you do with them all? Because that is what you are, you understand?

You are the formula. You think you are great or small, that you are the Atman, or this or that. So you are the past, you understand? The past is directing you, the past images, the past knowledge. So we come upon something very interesting, which is, all knowledge is the past, all technological knowledge is the knowledge of the past. That is a fact. What you know is the past, and the past projects, modified by the present into the future. So you, as an entity, are the past, the past being your memories, your traditions, your experiences. So you, the "me", the "I", the ego, the super-ego, the, super-self, the Atman is still the past. Now knowledge is the past, to which you can add or take away. All scientific knowledge, technological knowledge is the past. Of course you can add more to it, alter it, but the basis is the past. So the knowledge about yourself is the past. You are the past. Therefore being the past, there is division between the past, present and the future - what you have been, what you are, what you will be, all in terms of knowing, which means your God is already known, otherwise you would not have God. Do you see this?

Knowledge is absolutely necessary, otherwise you could not go home, otherwise we could not talk English and understand each other. Knowledge is the past, and knowledge is the memory which the brain has accumulated through centuries, through experiences.

So knowledge is necessary and knowledge also becomes an impediment in relationship, in relationship between human beings - you as a Christian, Buddhist, Hindu. You see the problem, the beauty of the problem, that you need knowledge, otherwise you could not function, and you also see how knowledge is the past - the image you have built - prevents relationship.

So we are asking the question, how is it possible that knowledge is absolutely necessary and how is it possible that very knowledge, which the brain has accumulated through centuries, does not interfere with relationships? Because relationship is the most important thing. On that, all our social behaviour, society, morality, everything is based on relationship and there is no relationship if there is no image - which is knowledge. What will you do, knowing that you need knowledge, knowing that knowledge interferes with relationship?

Now if you have come to this point - if you have followed it all along from the very beginning - you will see that your mind has become extraordinarily sensitive, and being sensitive, it has become intelligent. And it is that intelligence that will prevent the image interfering in the relationship, not your decision, not your saying, "I must, I must not." It is the understanding of this whole process, as we have gone into not verbally, not intellectually, but really understanding it with your heart, with your brain, with your whole capacity, that will make you see the truth of it. When you see the truth that knowledge is necessary and that knowledge interferes in relationship, because knowledge is the image, then the mind has become extraordinarily pliable, extraordinarily sensitive, and it is the sensitivity, which is the highest form of intelligence,

which will prevent the interference of images as knowledge in relationship. Right, you have got it? Do get this, please, then you will see you will lead quite a different kind of life. Then you will banish away for ever the division that man has brought about between himself and another. So the whole problem of the past, which is knowledge, which is the accumulated experience, is absolutely necessary, and any other image, any other knowledge in relationship becomes totally irrelevant.

Surely love is not an idea, love is not an image, love is not the cultivation of memory of a person whom you think you love. Love is something totally new, every minute, because it is not cultivable, it is not the result of effort, strain, conflict. Look, Sir, if you listen to what is being said attentively, that attention is love. Otherwise there must be a division in this attention, therefore that brings conflict. When there is love, there is no conflict, because love is not a structure of the image-builder.

So a man who would live at peace with himself and with the world must understand this whole structure of knowledge, knowledge about himself and the world, knowledge which is the past, and a mind that lives in the past, is no mind at all. It is a dead, static mind. That is what has happened in this country. You are living on other people's experiences, and the Gita and the Upanishads and your guru are your destroyers. Please do see this, because you have not exercised that marvellous instrument which is the brain. And you use it technologically when you become an engineer, when you are fighting for a job, when you are cheating your neighbour in business, but refuse to use the brain in understanding human relationship, upon which all our social

behaviour is based. Unless you do this with your heart, with your whole being, your seeking God, your wanting truth has no meaning whatsoever. You can go hunting after each guru and will never find truth, you will never come across it. For you must learn, you must have a mind that is sensitive, clear, objective, healthy, that has no fear.

Do you want to ask any questions? It is rather late.

Question: What is love?

Krishnamurti: What is love? Love is not something to be described. Now Sir, do listen, do sit down two minutes and I will stop. You know you must ask questions not only of the speaker but of about yourself, which is much more important why you believe, why you have formulas, why you follow your guru, your books, your leaders, why you believe in God, why you have become so dull, find out why you have become callous, indifferent to everything, except your own personal vanity or acquisition of money. Unless you ask questions of yourselves and find the right answer for yourselves, asking the speaker questions has very little meaning. But when you ask the questions of the speaker, share the question with him, go into it. Then whatever understanding comes is not your understanding, it is understanding, not personal understanding. Intelligence is not personal, and that is the beauty of intelligence.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 13 2ND PUBLIC TALK BOMBAY 10TH FEBRUARY 1971

THERE are several things we should talk over together. One of the things is freedom, It is really a very important subject and needs a great deal of exploration, a great deal of enquiry to find out whether the mind can ever be free or is always time-bound. Is it possible for the mind, living in this world, functioning as it should with all the daily problems - with the many conflicting desires, opposing elements, influences, and various contradictions that one lives in, with all the tortures, with passing joys - whether such a mind can ever be free, not only superficially but profoundly, at the very root of its existence. And so we have asked this question, whether man living in this extraordinarily complex society, where he has to earn a livelihood, perhaps have a family, live in competition and acquisition" whether he can go beyond all that, not into abstraction, not into an idea or formula or a concept of freedom, but actually be free.

"Freedom from" is an abstraction, but freedom is in observing "what is" and going beyond it. Do not look puzzled. But first, if I may suggest, just listen, not accepting or denying, just have the sensitivity to listen, and not draw any conclusion or assume any defensive reaction or resist or translate what we are saying into your own, particular language. You listen as you listen to those crows - noisy, flying about, trying to find a tree for the night where they will be unmolested, and be quiet - you listen to them, and you cannot do anything about it, you cannot ask them to stop calling to

each other. You just listen. But if you resist the noises they make, that very resistance denies the freedom to listen to the crows. And if you resist, because you say, "I want to listen to what is being said and they are making an awful lot of noise", that very resistance is an act that prevents you from listening and therefore denies the freedom to listen.

Now, if you will, listen, not just merely to the words or the meaning of the words only, but try to comprehend the whole meaning, the inwardness of this word "freedom". That is, we are together going to share this question, travel together, investigate together, understand together, what this freedom implies, whether a mind - that is your mind - that has been nurtured in time, a brain that has evolved through time, that has accumulated thousands of experiences, that has been conditioned in various cultures, whether such a mind can be free, not in some utopian, religious sense of freedom, but actually living in this confused, contradictory world. We are going to ask whether this mind, your mind, as you know it, as you have observed it, whether it can ever be completely, both on the surface and deep inwardly, free. Because if we do not answer this question for ourselves, we shall always be living in the prison of time, time being the past, time being thought, time being sorrow. Therefore unless we really see the truth of this, we shall always live in conflict, in sorrow, in the prison of thought. I do not know how you regard this question, not what your religious teachers have said, not the Gita, the Upanishads, your gurus, your social structure, your economic condition, but what you think, what you say, which is far more important than all the books put together. It means that you yourself have to find the truth of this. And never

repeat what others have said but first find out for yourself, test it out for yourself, testing what you think, what you see, not test what others have said. Therefore you are free from authority. Right?

As I said, please listen. As you are listening, act, that is, as you listen, see the truth of it. We have to rely on scientific knowledge, other people's experiments, other people's accumulation of mathematical, geographical, scientific, biological knowledge. That is inevitable. If you would become an engineer, you have to have the accumulated knowledge of those who have gathered knowledge about mathematics, structure, strain and so on. But if you would find out for yourself what truth is - if there is such a thing - you cannot possibly accept the accumulated knowledge of what others have said, which is what you have done. You are full of knowledge of the Gita, the Upanishads.

What matters is what you think, how you live. And to find out how you live, how you act, what you do, you have to discard totally all the experts' knowledge, the professionals who have given you instructions on how you should live. Please do understand this. Freedom is not permissiveness. Freedom is necessary for the human mind, so that it can function healthily, normally, sanely. As I said, freedom from something - like freedom from anger, freedom from jealousy, freedom from aggression - is an abstraction and therefore not real. A man who says to himself, "I must be free from anger or from jealousy", is not free; but the man who says, "I must observe the fact of anger, actually what it is and learn the whole structure of anger," through observation directly for himself, and through that observation there is freedom, not through the cultivation of the opposite.

To cultivate bravery when one is not brave is not freedom, but to understand the nature and the structure of what is cowardice and remain with it not trying to suppress it or go beyond it, but remain with it, look at it, learn all about it, perceive the truth of it instantly, such a mind is free from cowardice and bravery. You are getting this? That is, direct perception is freedom, not the cultivation of the opposite. The cultivation of the opposite implies time.

I am greedy, sensitive, ambitious, competitive, and being greedy my cultural response is not to be greedy, because the books have said it, and gurus have said it. So my response is not to be greedy, to strive after not being greedy. I am and I must not. The "must not" involves time, and the factor between "what is" - which is "greedy" - and what you should be is a time interval. In that time interval, a great many factors come in, therefore the mind is never free from greed, whereas direct perception of the fact of greed, not the cause of it, not the explanation or the justification or the denial of it, just the observation without any movement of thought, is freedom from greed.

Look, Sir, you live with formulas, don't you, concepts, principles, beliefs, ideals? You demand a purpose, a goal, something you want to attain, reach, don't you? Observe it in yourself. You have beliefs, goals, purposes, conclusions. Now, you are in a confused world living a confused life, living a contradictory life, and you say there must be clarity, there must be enlightenment, there must be hope. So there is a time interval between what you are and what you are trying to achieve. Right? Between what you are and the principles, the conclusions, the concepts that you have, is a time interval. In that time interval other

factors, other influences, other incidents happen. Therefore you never can achieve that, and therefore there is no freedom in the future. Therefore, when you deny or when you see the truth that conclusions, formulas, beliefs, ideals are the factors of time, and therefore they are binding and they do not bring freedom, then you completely wipe all that away. Then you have only what is left, which is your greed. Now to look at it completely, totally, is to never suppress it, never to give explanations, never to justify, but just to observe. As you listen to those crows, you do not do anything about it. In the same way listen, observe completely the fact that there is greed and remain with it - which means that the observer is the observed, the observer is greed and not separate from the thing he calls greed - and see that totally. In that perception there is total freedom. The observer is the past, the observer is the accumulated knowledge who says you must not be greedy or, justifies greed. So can this mind observe without the observer? When it so observes, perceives, there is a total comprehension of freedom.

Look, without a mind being free, you cannot live in order. You live in disorder - not only outwardly but inwardly. You try to bring about order, but that which you try to bring about, which you call order, is within the area of disorder. So a mind has to have order, and total order is total freedom. I am going to go into this question, of order. Please do listen, give, your heart to this, because it is your life. First, seeing actually, not theoretically, that your life is disorderly, contradictory, a putting on of masks in front of your guru and in front of your politician, in front of your superior, pretending, hypocritical, without any sense of love, consideration,

beauty - that is your life. In that life in which you live there is great disorder, and the mind, the brain realizes that it must live in order, whether that order is neurotic or not, in that very neurosis it tries to find order. Sir, have you noticed that when you have learnt something mechanical, technological, your mind, your brain functions very easily, almost mechanically, which means the brain needs to function in perfect order. You see that, don't you?

The brain needs protection, order, it must be completely secure, to function properly. It thinks it will function properly if it has a conclusion, because it sees round itself great disorder, and it needs to have a belief, a principle, a conclusion, in which it hopes to have order, safety. So it is all the time striving to find order, whether in illusion, in authority, in somebody else's experience, in a conclusion. It is trying to find order; but that discovery or trying to find order in illusion creates conflict and therefore it runs away from that conflict into another conclusion. So the mind, the brain is constantly seeking order, because in order there is security. The more precise the order, the greater the security, the greater is the capacity to function. And it has tried to find order in nationality which brings disaster; because it brings wars, it has tried to find order in authority, obedience, following, and to create thereby conflict between "what is" and "what should be". And it tries to find order in morality, social morality, and that two brings disorder, which is contradiction. It tries to find order in knowledge, and knowledge is always the past, so the past becomes tremendously important, or the future, which is a concept, a principle, an ideal. So the brain is constantly seeking order and at the same time creating disorder, because it has not found order.

That is what you want - don't you - security, order? There is complete disorder politically, religiously, in the family, in every way. And the mind, the brain escapes from this disorder into what it calls the ideal, or the promise of some guru who gives you enlightenment. So order can only be found, order comes naturally, easily by itself when you understand disorder. The understanding of the disorder of your life, not how to go beyond it, not how to suppress it, but to understand the nature of it, the structure of it, then out of that comes order, which is living. So freedom is order, complete order, and that order has come into being through the understanding of disorder, not through seizing order. If you seize order, it becomes a principle, an idea a formula, but if you actually understood totally the disorder of your life, of everyday life, if you do not run away from it, try to cover it up, suppress it but observe it, look at it with your whole heart and mind, then out of that comes an extraordinary sense of order which is living, moving, and has a quality of vitality, vigour.

I do not know if you have noticed that before you go to sleep, if you are at all sensitive, you review the day, don't you? Do you do it? That is, you review - you say I should have done that, I should not have said that, it would have been better if I had put it that way. You review the day, you look over the whole day, and the mind does it, because it tries to bring order before it goes to sleep. As I said, both in one's life and outwardly order is essential in relationship, and the brain is always trying to find order in various directions, always moving out or moving inward, and as you observe before you sleep, if the mind is at all sensitive, it reviews the day and looks over it and says, "This is a mistake, that is the

right thing", looking, observing, trying to bring order.

And when you go to sleep, it tries to establish order through dreams because it demands absolute order, because in order there is protection, safety. So when the mind during the day, not artificially, not with determination, not with will, observes totally the confusion, the untruth, the hypocrisy, the contradiction and brings order there, and then when it goes to sleep, the mind, the brain then, because it has brought order during the day by observing the disorder it lives in, then that brain has a quality of total freedom to observe.

So if you observe your life as it is, see the beauty of it and the destructive nature of confusion, with a mind that has no formula, that has no principles, that is free to observe and so listen, then there is freedom, which is order, a freedom that is complete, living in this world; and it is only such a mind that is free, that knows what love is, what beauty is, and it is only such a mind that being free, can perceive what truth is.

Now would you like to ask questions? Before you ask them, please, you are asking the question of yourself, and we will together answer the question. You ask the question and do not wait for the speaker to answer it, but in the very asking of this question we are both of us going to share the question. That is affection, that is care, that is love, not the waiting for some authority to answer it. When the authority answers it, whether it is the book, the guru or anybody, you are not seeking truth. You want confirmation, assurance, but if you ask the question, does not matter how trivial, and you are asking it of yourself, and in the very asking of it aloud, then we share it together. Then it is a common problem. What is

common is communicable. Therefore we can share it together and in that sharing there is great beauty, there is great affection. That is love - to share.

Question: I have no energy to be aware of my problems and deal with them.

Krishnamurti: Now, how do you have energy? That is the question, is it not, Sir? Now we are sharing it together, you understand. Again this is really a very, very complex problem. First of all, one has to understand what energy is. We have broken it up into many fragments: the energy that needs to do business, the energy that needs to write a poem, the energy that needs to be a good, first class, non-governmental scientist. You need energy to understand, and that understanding has been broken up too, as into intellectual understanding, verbal understanding. You have broken up your energy into sexual energy and moral energy. Your energy is broken up.

So man has broken up this energy, human energy and cosmic energy. That is a fact, if you observe it in your life. You are one thing in the office and another at home. You say one thing which you do not mean and do something else. If you are rich, you want to be flattered, if you are poor you are frightened. So that goes on. So there is constant breaking up of energy. When you break up energy, there is conflict.

Observe this, Sir, in yourself. There is conflict when you break up your life as a religious life, as a business life, as a scientist, as a politician, as a cook, or whatever it is. When you break it up there must be conflict. And where there is conflict there is the ending of energy, there is a wastage of energy. When you resist that is a

wastage of energy; when you run away from "what is" that is a wastage of energy. when you follow your guru who tells you what to do and between what should be and what you are, there is conflict, and where there is conflict it means there is division and therefore struggle, pain, fear.

So where there is conflict there is wastage of energy, and this conflict will inevitably arise when there is the breaking up of energy. When you do not live a totally harmonious life, there is a wastage of energy. When you say to find God, truth, you must lead a celibate life - and there is a battle in you: the desire, the sexual urges, the lust, being suppressed, held back, disciplined, controlled - in that, between what you think is the way to reality and what actually is, there is a contradiction. In that contradiction there is conflict and the very conflict is a total wastage of energy. So one has to find a way of living which is both chaste, non-corrupt, in which there is no conflict whatsoever. Then you are full of energy.

Sir, look, most of us have had sorrow, not only the physical pain but devastating sorrows in our lives, deep, biting sorrows, tears, aching hearts, despair. The thing called sorrow, we have all had it, you all know it. And you run away from it, you say it is my past karma, or you try to find the cause of it, or you try to escape from it through going to the temples, churches, prayers, meetings - you know all the things we do to run away from this terrible thing called sorrow. So what happens? Sorrow is there and you escape from it through radio, sex, god, whatever it is, and in that escape, in that running away, from "What is", there is contradiction, and therefore there is conflict. In that there is wastage of energy, whereas if the mind remained alone with sorrow, not trying to run

away, not trying to resist, remained completely alone, then you would see out of that lone perception comes that tremendous energy that transforms that sorrow into passion - not lust - into intensity, into a tremendous energy, which no book no guru, no teacher can give. Therefore you have to learn, observe from yourself and you have an energy that is unending.

Question: Can we see God through observation? Krishnamurti: I do not know what it means, the meaning of that word, but I think the gentleman means, can we seek God or can we, through observation of nature, of man, of the beauty of the earth, the beauty of a cloud, the beauty of a face, the laughter of a child, through observing all this marvel of life, can we find God? Is that the question, Sir?

You will never find it if you seek it. You understand the answer? You will never find it if you run after it. You will never find it if your intention is in seeing the beauty of the earth, in seeing the light on the water, in seeing the perfect line of a mountain, and you hope through seeing, to find that. You will never find it because you cannot find that through anything, through your sacrifice, through your worship, through your meditation, through your virtue, You will never come upon it because your motive is all wrong, because you want to find that, not in living, but somewhere else.

You must establish right relationship with man first, which means you must know what it means to love, what it means to be compassionate, what it means to be generous when you have a great deal, what it means to share with another the little that you have, to establish this marvellous order in living, daily living. Then

if you have established that order, which is freedom, then there is no seeking.

When you use the word "seek", there are several things involved in that word, in the meaning of that word. When you are seeking, you hope to find something, and how do you know when you have found something? You are all seekers after truth or experimenters of truth. You are always talking about seeking. Please listen to this. In seeking there are several things involved - there is the seeker and the thing that he seeks after. When the seeker finds what he thinks is truth, is God, is enlightenment, he must be able to recognise it. He must recognise it. Right?

"Recognition" implies previous knowledge, otherwise you cannot recognise. I cannot recognise you if I had not met you yesterday. Therefore when I say this is truth, I have already known it and therefore it is not truth. So a man who is seeking truth lives a life of hypocrisy, because his truth is the projection of his memory, of his desires, of his intention to find something other than "what is", a formula. So seeking implies duality - the one who seeks and the thing sought after - and where there is duality there is conflict. That is wastage of energy. So you can never find it, you can never invite it.

The God that you call God which is your invention, that is not God. The thing made by hand in the temple, in an image, is not God, or the thing made by your thought is not God, is not truth, and that is what you are living on - the image made by the hand or the mind - and if you really enquire into this, if there is or if there is not something which is timeless, not within the field of thought, then you must understand the whole nature of thought. But merely

asking, "Will I find God?", you will find him, because what you want you will find, but it won't be true, it won't be the real. So what is important is to understand "what is", which is your life, this shoddy, narrow, petty life that you lead, the life of your own vanity. If you bring order in that then you will have freedom, complete, total freedom, and it is only such a mind that can see "what is".

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 14

3RD PUBLIC TALK BOMBAY 14TH FEBRUARY

1971

I think there is only one fundamental question, which is, how to live in this world with intelligence, sanity, with great affection, beauty, in spite of all our complications; how to live a life that has depth, that in the very living there is significance, a life that is without conflict, a sane, healthy life with freedom and great intelligence. If we could answer this question, not merely verbally or intellectually, if we could put this question to ourselves and find out for ourselves a way of living, that, it seems to me, would be the most important thing. Having right relationship with man, a harmonious, rational, balanced life in relationship, understanding that and living it - not merely becoming a sannyasi, following the latest craze, doing some kind of penance, a singing and dancing and all that kind of business that goes on - if we could find out a way of living where there is really a great deal of love, intelligence, beauty, then perhaps we would be able to find out for ourselves, not through somebody else, if there is something beyond time, something which is not within the field of everyday strife.

And this evening, we might perhaps devote this whole hour to finding out for ourselves how to live, how to live with real understanding, with a great sense of beauty, with a great sense of human understanding in which there is no conflict in relationship. If we could spend some time on that, then perhaps we could go on from there to find out for ourselves what meditation is, if there is such a thing as truth, as a reality. But first we must lay the

foundation, not the foundation of another, however wise or however caught up in illusion or full of his own experience, but if we could lay this foundation in our own lives, in the life of our daily existence, if we could do that we would have a world - not a utopian world, not an ideological world - a world of sanity, a world in which there is no war, no division between those who know and those who do not know, those who pretend that they have attained enlightenment and those who are seeking enlightenment, those who assert that there is and those who assert that there is not. So, if you will, let us find out if we can change entirely our way of living.

First of all, we must look at this whole existence which we call living, in which is included the earning of a livelihood, in which there is this problem of conflict, physical pain and the psychological, mounting sorrow, the thing that we call love, joy, pleasure, fear, anxiety and understand what it means to die - living and dying - the whole of that, not just one fragment of it. That is why we must look, observe the whole field of our existence, not just one corner of it; not just how to earn a livelihood or just escape from this into some illusion, but to consider together this whole phenomenon of existence in which all the things are included. As we now are, we are composed of many fragments, the good, the bad, the greedy, the ambitious, the one that is in sorrow and the one that is seeking an understanding and escaping from sorrow. There is this fragmentation not only inwardly but outwardly. We are all that, because we are the world and the world is us: the society is made, put together by us, and though we are caught in it, we are part of it, we have constructed it, and we have to understand this whole phenomenon of existence.

So let us look first at our lives, your life, not the life of any saint, not the life described in any book, not the life of your favourite guru, not the life that you want to live, but the actual daily life, the monotony of it, the boredom of it, the loneliness of it, the fear of it, the aggression, the violence, the sexual pleasures, the fear, the joy, the unthinking acceptance, imitation conformity - all that is our daily life. And that is what we have to understand and in the very process of understanding, see if we can bring about a radical change in all that, whether it is possible to end all sorrow in our life, to be free from all fear, to find out for ourselves what it means to love, and to consider the thing that so many are afraid of, which is death. All that is our life.

So we have to look first at what actually is and not get frightened about it, or feel there is no hope or that there is hope. We have to first look at it. Can you look at your life? Do please listen to what is being said. Look at your own life, and if you do look, one finds a great sense of striving, of insufficiency, conformity, fear, the pursuit of pleasure. Don't you find this, that your life as it is lived, whether you are aware of it or not, is bound with fear, with anxiety, a great sense of loneliness and utter boredom? Don't you find that not being able to solve this you run away from it, you run away to temples, read the Gita or listen to the commentaries made by the professionals on the Gita or accept what your gurus say? So that is your life. And is it possible to change it all, not only the outward circumstances but the inner structure which has created the outer? Is it possible radically to change the psychological nature of yourselves? If it is not possible, then you have no energy, do you understand? If it is possible, you

are full of energy. We have concluded that it is not possible, that we cannot possibly, totally change. We have got into the habit of living with fear, living with sorrow, hiding ourselves from our own secret miseries. And so we have made life into something which we think is not possible to change, and therefore we escape from that central issue.

We are going to find out, if we can this evening, whether it is possible, whatever we are - intellectual or emotional, leading a bourgeois existence, having a middle-class outlook on the whole of life - whether it is possible to change at all. We are going to investigate together, you understand that word, the meaning of that word? When we are exploring together, it means you must also share, you must also be very serious to find out for yourself whether it is possible to change, and this change cannot take place except in relationship. You cannot go away into isolation and try to dissolve all your troubles. It can only be solved in relationship, because it is only in relationship that you discover all your troubles, all your miseries, all your confusion. So we must do it together, you and I, because it is our problem, it is our misery, as this is our life to live on, to be happy, to enjoy the beauty of nature, of life, not everlastingly live in sorrow, confusion, misery. So together we have to solve this. "Together" means relationship.

Don't you find when you observe in yourselves that there are two active principles, one fear and the other is pleasure? Don't you find that pleasure is in different forms, whether that pleasure is to seek God or to become a great person politically, this way or that? And don't you find in yourselves the active principle of fear going on? These two things exist. We want more of the one, which is

pleasure, and less of the other, which is fear. Right? Now sitting like that there you are really not frightened at this present moment. You have no fear at this actual moment, you may have that fear when you go back; but sitting there listening, you have no fear. Though it is always there in the background, you cannot possibly invite that fear and observe it. You cannot say, "I am going to be frightened and let me look." But you can, through understanding attachment, come upon what it means to be afraid. As we said, fear and pleasure are our main movements, contradictory movements in life, and being afraid, unconscious of fear, not being aware that we are afraid, we attach ourselves, we depend on people, on ideals, on our guru or on our wife or husband. Don't you find that, that you depend on people - not the postman, not the milkman - depend on people round you or depend on somebody in whom you think you have confidence?

So, what is involved in this dependence? First of all, there is no freedom when you depend on somebody, whether it is your wife or your guru. And when you depend on somebody psychologically, inwardly, you are seeking comfort, sustenance and when you depend on that person you must possess that person, you must dominate that person or submit yourself to that person. And when you are observing that you are dependent, you see that the source of this dependence is fear, fear of not being able to stand alone, fear of making a mistake, fear of not following the straight path - fear of not having comfort, not having somebody as a companion, not being able to depend on somebody. So through dependence, as you are sitting now, you discover that you are really frightened. Without inviting fear you discover that basically you are

frightened. Are we communicating with each other?

"Communication", as we said the other day, is to share together a common problem. This is our common problem. And when you depend on a person, there must be inevitably not only fear but jealousy, anxiety. So all that is involved in dependence; and can a mind be free of this dependence? Because, people like to be possessed by another. Haven't you noticed it? They like to belong to somebody, belong to a group, commit themselves to a certain pattern of action, a sense that they are leading a kind of righteous life. So when you look at it very carefully, you will see for yourself the basis of all this is fear. Then arises the question, is it possible to be free of that fear, not only the superficial fear in relationship and dependency but the deep-rooted fear?

Are you asking this question with me? That is, can you as a human being be completely free of fear because when you are afraid, you do the most extraordinarily stupid things. When you are afraid, you are almost unbalanced, neurotic, you cannot think clearly, observe truly. Haven't you noticed your life become dark, heavy? It becomes a burden, a torture. And not knowing how to resolve this fear, you run away from it. You run away doing the most absurd things.

There is the fear of physical pain. You have had pain, physical pain, years ago or a few days ago, agonizing pain or superficial pain, and that pain has left a mark on the brain, which is the memory of that pain which you have had two days ago or two years ago, and you do not want that pain to be repeated. What takes place then? Having had physical pain, you do not want it to be repeated and there is the idea that it might come back. In that idea,

there is fear. You think about the pain which you had yesterday or two days ago and you do not want it repeated. Thought, which is the response of memory, says "I do not want that pain again." So physically you cannot forget it, it is there, and as long as you think about it, you intensify the memory of that pain and therefore thinking about it increases the fear of that pain. You see that, don't you? Talking about the past pain sustains that pain and you may have that pain tomorrow, which is still thinking about pain, and so thought says, "I must not have pain." So there is fear.

So thought breeds fear. I may lose my job - the `may' is in the future - I think about it, so I get frightened. I think about death and thinking about it makes me afraid. So thought breeds fear, not only the fear of the past but also fear of the future. Unless you follow this very carefully, you won't be free of fear. Together we are going to see if you cannot totally be free of it. Then you will be a free man and you can then put away all your gurus. You will then be able to think, see, live very clearly, in an ecstatic state. So we must together understand this question basically. So thought sustains, gives a continuity to psychological pain as well as physical pain. Right? Wait there, leave it there.

You have had a great pleasure yesterday, sensory pleasure, sexual pleasure, or the pleasure of seeing a beautiful tree or the lovely sunset, the shape, the beauty and the dignity and the strength of a marvellous tree - the pleasure that you have had. All that is recorded. When you see a sunset, if you have ever taken the trouble to look, when you have looked, it is recorded in your brain, and when after seeing, at that moment there is no sense of, "I want it to be repeated." There is just the experiencing of it, then a second

later you say, "How beautiful that is, I want it to be repeated."

The desire to have it repeated is the beginning of pleasure. You understand this? The desire to have the repetition of an event which has given a delight, the pursuit of it, the demanding further experiencing of it is pleasure, which again is thought. That is, seeing the sunset, then thinking about it and wanting to be repeated, that is pleasure, isn't it? This is what you do when you have sexual pleasure, the repetition, the image, the thinking about it, chewing and wanting it again. So thought, thinking, breeds fear as well as pleasure. Right? Thought gives continuity to fear and a continuity to pleasure; but when you had physical pain yesterday or two years ago, to have it, to finish with it, not record it, then there is no continuity of it, the continuity brought about by thinking about it. I am going to go into that.

Please listen to this. Because, you see, Sirs, we are human beings, not merely animals. We have to live intelligently. We have to live a marvellous, beautiful life, and if one lives in fear, it is anxiety, guilt, sense of failure, fear of the dark, fear of death, fear of losing your money, fear of not becoming a great man and fear expresses itself in different ways. So thought nourishes, sustains, gives continuity to fear and pleasure.

The question then is, why does thought which has created such marvellous things in the world - technology, all the marvellous medicines, science, you know, what thought has done - that very thought breeds fear and sustains fear and pleasure? So what is thought and where should thought function completely, totally, rationally, sanely, and where should thought be completely quiet? Thought is the response of memory, knowledge, experience stored

up in the brain, and that memory, response, is thought. The memory, the intelligence, the knowledge has created the rocket which went to the moon, which has created the most marvellous technological things, the aeroplane, the most extraordinary things, and yet that very thought gives continuity to fear, and that very thought seeks pleasure, and that very pleasure becomes fear. You see the difficulty? You need thought to function rationally, objectively, sanely, reasonably, logically and also you see how thought continues to go with fear.

So we must find out why it is that thought always interferes - if I can use that word "interfere" - when there is an experience of pleasure or pain; why thought, when it is experiencing something, either physical pain or psychological pain, why thought comes in and holds it. Why? Are you asking the question too? You understand the problem, do you? To be able to speak English, I must have a great deal of knowledge of English, memory and all the rest of it and thought is using the words in order to convey something. Thought is using knowledge, and thought also uses knowledge which breeds fear, knowledge of pain of yesterday, knowledge of the pleasure of yesterday.

So the question is, why does thought always avoid the one which is fear and hold on to pleasure? That is one question. Why does thought interfere when there is an experience? You understand? I have an experience of the sunset and at that moment there is nothing to think at all; I am just looking at the beauty of that light. Then thought comes along and says, "I want that repeated again tomorrow, which is, knowledge as experience, which is pleasure, wants it to be repeated again. I have had pain,

which is the remembrance of that pain which is knowledge, and according to that knowledge or depending upon that knowledge, thought says, "I do not want it." You follow? Thought is doing that all the time, functioning between pleasure and pain. And thought is responsible for both. Right?

So knowledge on the one hand is essential, otherwise you cannot go home, otherwise you cannot talk your language, you cannot invent, you cannot construct if you are an engineer, and so on. Knowledge is essential, and also the knowledge of the pain of yesterday breeds fear. Right? So you have to find out for yourselves what it is that acts when thought is absent.

If you have followed from the beginning, observed all this, your mind has become sensitive, very alert, aware of the whole problem, you can look at it immediately and understand it instantly, not through analysis, but see it immediately. When you observe this, you find, don't you, that you have a mind that is learning and therefore it has become somewhat intelligent, because it has become sensitive about the problem, which before it has evaded? Now you are sensitive to the problem of fear and pleasure, therefore you are learning about it. The mind that is learning about fear and pleasure has not learnt the thing before, it is learning now.

You follow, I want to convey this to you with my heart, you understand, Sir, so that you get up from this place as a human being, living, not eternally frightened.

See, when you are learning about something, say, like the Italian or Russian language, you do not know about it, you are learning, therefore you come to it afresh. You do not know it, you will only know it as you accumulate knowledge about Italian or

Russian, but when you start, you know nothing. Now you think you know about fear, you think you know about pleasure, whereas you do not really know about it. So you are learning now - you see the difference? Therefore a mind that is learning is an intelligent mind, not the mind that says "I have learnt" or "I know what fear is". That is, a mind that is learning is an intelligent mind, not the mind that says, "Tell me all about it, you are my guru. I will follow, stand on my head, dance, do what you tell me, I will do all that in order to go to heaven." Such a mind is a stupid mind, it cannot learn, it is a dead mind, it is a neurotic mind, but a mind that is learning is the mind that says "I do not know, I am going to look at fear for the first time, I am going to look at attachment for the first time, I am going to find out for the first time what real pleasure is." So you see when you are learning, your mind is awake. A mind that is awake is an intelligent mind, and it is this intelligence that says when you should use knowledge and when not.

Look, Sir, I wish you were sitting up here and I was there, because you see, Sir, the speaker has not read a book about all this, neither the Gita, the Upanishad, nor any books - philosophical, psychological - books that pertain to the psyche of man. And one has to find the truth of this for oneself. Truth is not secondhand. You cannot get it through a guru, through a book. You have to learn about it, you understand Sir, learn; and the beauty of that learning is that you do not know. You do not know what truth is. Do not pretend, do not quote somebody. You really do not know, therefore learn about it, and to learn about it one must come with a passion, an intensity to find out. So a mind that is learning is an

intelligent mind, not the mind that repeats or is caught in a habit, "I am caught in fear. I do not know what to do about it", or a mind that says "I must have pleasure, more and more pleasure".

So learning brings intelligence, as you have intelligence when you are a first-class engineer, or a first-class non-governmental scientist. Then such a person has intelligence. So if you are really learning, not from me, then you have this extraordinary quality of intelligence which you cannot get from any book.

Now we are going to learn together what love is - learn. You have used that word, you have repeated that word and loaded it with all kinds of formula - love is godly, love is sacred, love is not profane - and you think you have understood it. Do you know what love is, do you? If you are really honest, not hypocritical, you will say, "I do not know, I only know what jealousy is, I know what sexual pleasure is - which I call love - I know all the agony that one goes through in what one calls love." But the nature of it, the beauty of it you really do not know.

So what is love? Do not form an opinion about it, do not have a formula. If you have, then you have stopped learning. Do you understand what love is? We are going to find out. I have to learn verbally what it means, which is not love at all. What is love? Is it pleasure, is it desire, is it the product of thought, is it the love of God and the hate of man? That is what you do - love God and kick your fellow man. You love the politician, not the politician perhaps - but you love your boss, you love your wife. Do you really love your wife? Yes? What does it mean? When you love something, you care for it. Sir, do you love your children - which means that you care for them, not only when they are little babies but when

they grow older, to see that they have the right education. When you love them you will see that you are not merely concerned that they should have a safe job, get married and settle down to follow the pattern of your generation.

So love is not jealousy, right? An ambitious man, an aggressive man can never understand what love is, can he? A violent man, can he understand what love is? And you are violent, aggressive, ambitious, competitive. What you call love is pleasure. You say you love your family. Do you know what it means to love somebody? It means no division, not your family, you understand, Sir? Your family is a deadly, inclusive, corrupt thing. That is all you know, that the family is against everybody else. How can you love your wife or your children when you are ambitious, when you in your office you are cheating, wanting a bigger position, playing up to the big man, how can you love?

Therefore, to find out what love is, approach it negatively - negatively means do not be ambitious. You say if I am not ambitious I will be destroyed by this world. Be destroyed by this world. It is a stupid world anyhow, it is a monstrous, immoral world. If you really want to find out the beauty, the real quality of love, you must deny all the virtue which man has cultivated. What you have cultivated is ambition, is greed, envy, competition, holding on to your little self and your little family. Your family is yourself. You have identified yourself with the family, which means you love yourself, not the family, not your children. If you really love your children, the world would be different; you would have no wars, Sir. So to find out what love is, you must put aside what it is not. Will you do it? You see you will do anything but

that; you will go to the temples, you will go to the guru, you will read endless sacred books, repeat mantras, play tricks upon yourselves, and you will talk about love of God, your devotion to your guru. You won't do the one thing, which is just to say, find out what it means to love, find out for yourself what it means to be aggressive.

So a man who has not love, but the things made by thought in his heart, will make a monstrous world, will construct, put together a society that is totally immoral. That is what you have done. So to find out, you must undo everything that you have done, not through time, not saying "I'll gradually undo it." That is another trick of your mind. Then you say it is my karma. When you really understand aggression, how terrible it is, in a little way or a big way, you drop it instantly, and in that dropping there is great beauty.

And also one has to find out what it means to die. You have seen death, you have seen people dying, carried to the grave, you know all that. You don't know what it means to die, do you? You have theories about death, you have beliefs about death, or you say, "I believe in reincarnation, what will happen after death." You all believe in reincarnation, don't you?

Voices: We do.

You know what that means - reincarnation? Listen to it very quietly; that you will be born next life, incarnate. You have assumed that you will be born, and you believe in that. What is "You"? The bank account? The house? The job? The memories? The quarrels? The anxiety? The pain? The fear? Is not that all "you"? Do you deny all that is you or do you say the "me" is

something greater than that? If you say the "me" is not the furniture, not my family, not my job, but something far superior than all this, who says it, and how do you know that there is something far superior? It is still thought that says that there is something far superior than this. So the thing that is far superior, the super-ego, the Atman, is still within the field of time, is still within the field of thought, and thought is you, your furniture, your bank account, your attachment to your family, to your nation, to your books, to your unfulfilled desires. And you say, "when I die all this rubbish goes back and I am born next life." And if you really believed actually with your heart, not with your shoddy little mind, if you thought that in your next life you would incarnate, it means that you would live today completely, because what you do today, you are going to pay for it tomorrow, next life.

When you die you are going to lose your bank account, you cannot take it with you, you may have it till the last minute - and most people want it till the last minute - it is quite funny, isn't it? So you really know nothing about death. So let us learn about it, not repeat what the speaker says because you will find if you repeat what the speaker says it is nothing, just words.

The physical organism dies, obviously. The scientist may give it another fifty years longer, and at the end of it dies, because it is being constantly used and misused. It has great many strains, pressures. It has been abused through drink, drugs, wrong eating, the constant battle. And that has put a tension on it - the heart failures, and the disease.

The body will die and what else will die with the body? Your furniture, your knowledge, all your hopes, despairs, your fulfilment

- is that going to die? So what is death? Please learn. We are learning together. To find out what it means, you must die, must not you? You with your ambitions, you must die, die to your ambition, die to your desire for power, position, prestige, die to our habits, your traditions, you understand? Do not argue, you cannot argue with death, you cannot just say, "Give me few more days, I have not finished my book. I want another child." You cannot argue, so do not argue, do not justify.

Die to one thing so completely, to your vanity to your aspirations, to your images about yourself or about your guru, about your life, end it then you will see what it means to die, then you will know what a mind is that is dead to the past. It is only such a mind that ends every day, it is only such a mind that goes beyond time.

Now, Sirs, you have listened. You have listened and therefore learnt what fear is, what pleasure is, and if you have learnt about these two, then you will know what love is, and love is the quality of mind - mind means the brain, the heart, the whole thing - in which there is no division, which means there is no fragmentation in oneself. So when you have done this, you will have a marvellous mind, a clear heart, and when you leave here this evening, learn all that you have learnt today and die to it. You understand? Die to everything that you have learnt this evening, so that tomorrow morning you are fresh again. Otherwise if you carry all the burden of today to tomorrow, then you give continuity to fear. So end each day and you will know the beauty of life, the beauty of truth, then you will have nothing to learn from anybody, because you are learning.

KRISHNAMURTI IN INDIA 1970-71 CHAPTER 15

4TH PUBLIC TALK BOMBAY 17TH FEBRUARY

1971

WE have during the past few talks touched upon various problems and in talking over these problems together, I hope that at least some of you have seen how to observe your own intimate problems, not only personal but also the world issues. We are going to talk about meditation. That word like "love", "discipline", is heavily loaded. Specially in the east, in this country, all of you verbally understand what is implied in meditation. I doubt very much whether you really know what meditation means. You have been told what to do, you have followed various systems, so your mind is not free to observe, investigate, to go into this extraordinary question. You have already filled your mind and your heart with other people's experiences, other people's conclusions, other people's assertions, and as in everything else you accept because in yourselves you do not know, you are uncertain, unhappy, confused. And somebody comes along and tells you that if you do these things - meditate, shut your eyes, breathe - then you would have a peaceful mind.

When you accept all this, you are not free to investigate, to really find out for yourselves what meditation is which has nothing whatsoever to do with any system, which has nothing whatsoever to do with any movement of will. It has certainly nothing whatsoever to do with conformity because method, system implies a practice leading you to a certain fixed conclusion or a state. System, method implies a mechanical practising of a certain

formula, repeating it over and over again, hoping thereby that you will experience what your gurus, your teachers, your books have told you. When you practise something over and over again, you not only become mechanical, insensitive, but your mind becomes dull.

You are always asking the "how", "How am I to meditate?" That is one of the childish questions you can ask about something which is so immense, to ask somebody "Tell me what to do, tell me how to hold the earth in one's hand, tell me how to hold the sea or the air in one's fist." And if you observe, that is what you all want. You want to experience something through a method. A method implies not only conformity not only measurement of achievement, but a method implies a system or a path to a fixed point, doesn't it? It is there, all that you do is to practice. It is most illogical, irrational, without any meaning whatsoever, because if you observe in your life, there is nothing stable, nothing permanent. You may want it, you may want a permanent relationship with your wife, with your children with your neighbour, with your society.

You cannot have anything permanent. Even your bank account is not permanent. No relationship is permanent. Everything is in a flux, is in movement, and realizing this consciously or unconsciously, we want something permanent, something that we can hold on to. And that we call truth, God, or what you like. So if you really understand, see the fact, see the truth that reality has no resting place, it is like being in an uncharted sea, you have to find your way to it - not your way or somebody else's way - but you have to find it.

And when you have a path leading to a reality, in, that is

implied time. To reach from here to there you require time, many days to travel, to cross the distance. And in that lag of time between here and there, there are other factors coming in. Therefore you say "Let me concentrate", think on that one thing and reject everything else, subjugate everything else to that one factor. The mechanical process of system brings about insensitivity, suppression, resistance against what you are actually, imposing on what you are something you think what ought to be, and there is conflict, battle. You want to control, you want to suppress, you discipline, force yourself to sit quietly, to breathe rightly, do all those fantastic things, hoping that you will eventually reach something about which you know absolutely nothing. So a wise man rejects the whole system, the whole idea, concept of systems altogether, because they don't lead anywhere. Then also you are burdened with this idea that you can experience truth, that you can achieve enlightenment, that you can find reality. Have not you heard your gurus, your people who teach you how to meditate say that they have experienced? The other day someone came and said "I have experienced reality. I know what truth is, I know. "You know that is one of the most stupid things you can ever say.

Listen, Sir, when a man says he knows, what does he know? When I say I know, I know something which is already over. Right? I know only something that is over, that is in the past, which means I live in the past. Please observe it for yourself, watch it in your own life. When I say "I know you" I only know the image of you and that image is the past. So a man who says he knows what truth is, does not know. He knows that which is dead,

over, finished.

Have you ever examined that word, the word "experience". It means to go through. When you go through something, it is over; but if you do not complete the whole movement, then it is recorded in the mind, then that becomes a memory. And what you are experiencing then is the past. When you are actually experiencing something - anger, sex, violence - at that moment there is no experience at all. Have you noticed this? When you are very angry or very envious, there is a total absence of the "me", the "you", the experiencer. Only a little later comes the experiencer, saying, "I have been angry." So those who say they know, they do not know. Those who say they have experienced reality, they have never experienced it, because to experience implies not only going through, but to experience something you must be able to recognise it. Otherwise you cannot experience. If I did not recognise you, which is an experience, I would not know you. Right? So when they use the word "experience", in that is implied recognition. To recognise implies that you have already known. Therefore that which you already know is not the real. So put aside systems completely. Anybody who says, "I have experienced" or anyone who says, "I know", beware of them. Do not get caught in that trap. That is their means of exploiting you.

And they have told you that you must concentrate, you must learn concentration, have they not? Have you ever investigated what concentration implies? There is in that an action of will, which is to resist every other thought and focus your energy, your thought on something, on a sentence or a word, or on a phrase, the repetition of some word which you call mantra - repeat, repeat.

Concentration implies resistance. You resist every other thought from seeping in or control your thoughts from wandering. So concentration is a form of will, resistance and suppression, whereas we need a free mind, a mind that is alive, full of energy. A mind that has been through conflict or is in constant conflict, wastes energy and you need energy. You need energy to go to your office, everything you do needs energy. So if you can put aside your favourite systems, if you can see the truth that concentration is merely a resistance and therefore constant conflict and wastage of energy, then you can find out for yourselves what are the requirements, what is necessary for a mind that is in a state of meditation.

Now let us investigate together, may we? We are not meditating together. That is one of the tricks - a group meditation - collecting a lot of people and all of them shutting their eyes and trying to meditate on something or other. We are investigating together what meditation is, not together meditating, because you do not know what it means, you only know what other people have said. Distrust completely what others say, including the speaker, because you are very easily persuaded. You are persuaded because you are greedy to experience something which you think is marvellous, so do not be influenced by the speaker.

Let us find out what are the implications of a mind that has the quality of meditation. We said you have to reject systems, methods, the desire to experience, because we explained what it means: the desire and the urge behind the desire to experience. So you have to put all that aside and also you have to put aside all the things that go in the name of meditation - breathing, dancing,

becoming emotional, sentimental. So what is involved in this thing called meditation? You are going to discover it, you are going to find out, not how to meditate, but the nature and the structure of a mind that is totally free, that does not function, that has no movement of will at all, for will is resistance. You are not learning from the speaker. You are your own guru and your own disciple, because you yourself have to come upon this. You have to learn and not imitate, not conform to any authority. So the first thing is you must understand yourself, because otherwise you have no rational basis of any thought, of any structure. If you do not understand yourself, how can you understand anything else, let alone something which may not exist? So the first movement is to understand yourself, understand yourself actually as you are, not what you would like to be. Understand yourself - the ugliness, the brutality, the violence, the greed, the envy, the agonizing loneliness, despair - that's what you are. And because you have not been able to solve it, because you have not been able to go beyond it, you introduce the super-self, the Atman. That is one of your tricks too. So you have a conflict between what you are and what you should be, or your Atman tells you what you should be. So you play a game. That does not help you to understand yourself. To understand yourself, you have to look at yourself. If I want to look at that tree, or that bird, I have to look. And I have to look at myself. I don't know what I am. I must learn about myself, not according to any philosopher or any psychologist or any book or any guide or guru.

Let us find out what we are. We are the bank account, we are envious, we are ambitious, corrupt, we say one thing and do

another, we are hypocrites, we put on masks, pretend and through all this, there is this sense of sorrow, pain, anxiety, tears, the ache of loneliness. That's what we are. And if you do not understand that and go beyond it, how can you understand something that is so extraordinarily beautiful. So you have to learn about yourself and here comes a great difficulty: because one's self is in constant movement, one's self is changing, one's self is not permanently greedy or permanently violent or permanently sexual, there is a constant change, moving, living. One has to learn about the living thing. To learn about the living thing, you have to watch it anew each minute. You see the difficulty? To learn about myself who am a living entity, not a dead thing, this living thing has to be observed, and what you have learnt about it in one minute must be dropped and picked up again the next minute. So you are learning about a living thing all the time anew, not that you have learnt and then from that knowledge you observe what is a living thing. If you really do it, this is one of the most fascinating things, because your mind then retains very little, contains the essential technological knowledge and nothing else. So your mind watches this movement of the "me" which is such a complex entity, not only at the superficial level but at the deeper level.

I do not know if one has the time to go into all this. I will put it very briefly, please listen to it. You may be conscious, watch yourself and learn each minute anew, every minute superficially. How are you going to learn about the secret of your mind, the hidden motives, the complex heritage? You know it is all there, hidden. How are you going to learn about it? To learn about it is not to analyse it, but to watch it during the day: all the movement

and the intimations and the hints of the secret desires. Watch it, be open to discover the motives, the intention, the tradition, the heritage.

So when you watch it all day and when you go to sleep, the mind then is completely quiet. There are no dreams, because dreams are merely a continuation in symbolic form of the daily contradictory conflicts; but if you have understood the daily movement of your life, your greeds, your envies, your angers, all that, then you will see that you are emptying the mind of everything of the past. So there must be self-knowing all the time. Knowing implies the active present. Then you need discipline. We have suppressed, controlled, conformed, imitated, and that's what we call discipline like a soldier disciplined.

Have you watched soldiers, what they are like? You know what they are, so they don't have to be described. And that is what we have reduced discipline to: a practice. And in that kind of discipline which you have, which all your gurus and the rest of them do, in that there is no freedom. There is decay, deterioration, whereas learning about oneself, learning all the time - not "having learnt" - brings about its own order. If I am learning about this whole process of living, that very learning brings its own order, and order is its own virtue. The thing that you cultivate is not virtue. So there must be knowing oneself, there must be this order, which is discipline, and there must be no action of will. We will go into that a little bit.

What is will? When you say "I will, I won't, I must, I should", what does that mean - the assertion, the decision, the statement of a desire "to be" - "I will do that"? In the action of will there is choice

- I will not do this but I will do that. You are following all this? Do please. Because you see, unless you learn all this from yourselves you will have a miserable life. You can escape from it by fighting. That is what you all know, only these two things: to resist, to escape. Resist means fight. Escape, you know, going to the temples, gurus, taking drugs, marijuana, drink, sex, the whole gamut of escapes. And will is implied in all this. Can one lead a daily life without the movement and the action of will, which means a life in which there is no choice at all?

When you have choice, you have contradiction. Choice exists when you are confused, doesn't it? When I do not know what to do, I am confused, and out of confusion comes choice and out of choice the action of will. Why are you confused? Most people are, why? It is because you do not accept what actually is. You try to alter what is to something else. And the moment you do that, there is conflict and out of that conflict, confusion. So the action of will is the outcome of confusion.

Meditation is a movement in which there is no action of will whatsoever. If you have done all this or you are doing all this, then you have a question, which is : what is the brain concerned with? The brain is the result of the past. The brain structure - the cells - is the result of centuries upon centuries of evolution. It has collected tremendous knowledge to survive. That is all it is concerned with - to survive - and finding physical survival becoming more and more difficult, because of the explosion of population, national divisions - the Hindu, the Muslim, the Christian, the German - it tries belief. The brain demanding security, safety, survival, tries one thing after the other. It has hopes in nationalism, in the family, in the bank

account. And not being able to find it, then it hopes to find that permanency, that security in some belief, in some God, in some kind of illusion. And that illusion becomes tremendously important, and that is what you are doing. Your nationalism is an illusion, your Gods are an illusion, you have invented them. Your gurus, your systems of morality - in that there is no safety.

So the brain demands, needs complete security to function rationally, healthily, and the brain finds that there is no security in thought. Previously it had sought security in thought. Thought is the only instrument you have, and thought is the past, is reaction to the past. Thought is not free, it is as old as the hills, because thought is the response of memory. So neither in belief nor in your Gods nor in your political systems, in your religious organizations, in your idols, temples, in your gurus, is there any safety, because they are all the inventions of thought. You understand? See the truth of it, not the word, the meaning, the description or the explanation, but see the truth of it.

So what happens? The brain cells are only concerned with survival, and with nothing else, not with Gods, not with illusion. There is only physical survival and that you would say is not spiritual at all; merely to survive, that is not spiritual, and you think spirituality is the invention of thought with all its illusions. It is only when the brain is concerned with physical survival alone that the rest of the brain is totally empty. That means the brain then is completely quiet, you understand?

Sirs, you know consciousness is heritage - you know what that means? Consciousness is the result of time, consciousness is the content of itself, which is time, sorrow, confusion, misery; and

intelligence has no heritage. Then you see, when the mind sees the importance of total survival and nothing else, there is intelligence. Then it will organize society entirely differently, then its morality will be real order.

We are asking what is a mind that is completely silent, because it is only when the mind, the brain is completely quiet that it can perceive. If I want to listen to what you are saying, I must listen completely quietly, mustn't I? When you say to me, "I love you", I must listen with my heart which has no movement of contradiction. The mind must listen, and therefore it is necessary for a mind to observe that it must be completely quiet. Just to see the truth of it, not how to make the mind quiet. If you ask how to make the mind quiet, you are back in your old trap. And there are thousands of gurus to tell you how to keep your mind quiet. But if you see that to perceive the tree, the cloud with the light of the setting sun on it, to see the light on the water, on a stretch of water, just to see it, the beauty of it, your mind must be completely quiet. If you are listening to somebody who threatens your life, you have to listen, haven't you? You listen to your bosses very, very carefully, don't you? You may not like it, you may resent it, but you have got to listen, because your life depends on it, your livelihood, your money, so at that moment you are very quiet. In the same way listen, observe the truth that to see and hear anything, both sensory and non-verbal, the mind must be quiet. That's a truth, that is sane, but a man who has beliefs, who is steeped in tradition, who calls himself a Hindu, a Buddhist, will never perceive that which is true. Therefore, for a mind to be completely quiet is very simple, really so simple, because it is only in that quiet state that you perceive the

beauty of the earth, the beauty of the tree, the beauty of a bird or a face, and without beauty you will never come upon what is truth, you will never see what is truth.

You know what beauty means? Not architecture, not the design in space, not the painting, not the beautiful face or the beautiful sari, the colour, but that beauty which comes when there is no movement of the "me", when there is no movement of the will, when there is no movement of time, reaching out, moving outwardly or inwardly. In that there is no beauty. There is beauty only when there is total absence of will, the "me". Then there is passion and in that passion there is great beauty. So a mind that is in meditation is concerned only with meditation, not with the meditator. The meditator is the observer, the censor, the thinker, the experiencer. And when there is the experiencer, the thinker, then he is concerned with reaching out, gaining, experiencing; and that thing which is timeless cannot be experienced. There is no experience at all. There is only that which is not nameable.

Look, Sirs, because the mind is quiet, the body becomes still, not the other way round. You force your body to sit still. You do all kinds of things to come upon this strange beauty of silence. Do not do it, just observe. Look, Sirs, you know in all this are various powers of clairvoyance, reading somebody's thought. There are various powers, you know what I am talking about, don't you? You call them siddhis, don't you? Do you know all these things are like candles - candlelight in the sun? When there is no sun, there is darkness, and then the light of the candle is very important; but when there is the sun, the light, the beauty, the clarity, then all these powers, these siddhis, are like candlelight. They have no

value at all. and when you have the light, there is nothing else - developing various centres, the chakras, kundalinis, you know all that business. You need a sane, logical, reasoning mind, not a stupid mind. A mind that is dull can sit for centuries breathing, concentrating on its various chakras, and you know all that playing with kundalinis, - it can never come upon that which is timeless, that which is real beauty, truth and love.

So put aside the candlelight which all the gurus and the books offer you. And do not repeat a word that you yourself have not seen the truth of, which you yourself have not tested.

MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 10TH JANUARY 1971 'THE OBSERVER AND THE OBSERVED'

Shall we go on with what we were talking about the other day when we met here? We were saying, weren't we, how very important it is that the human mind, which has been cultivated through time, through various experiences and knowledge, which are all the same, such a mind should undergo a total transformation. And we more or less pointed out the way of thought, its limitation, and only when there is freedom from the known, from knowledge, is there a possibility of total revolution. That's what we were more or less talking about.

This evening I think we ought to go into many other problems. Which is, what importance is it for a human being to change himself when the environment, the society, the culture, is so corrupt, so disintegrating? And one sees the necessity of changing the environment, the environment being the society, the religion, the culture and so on. And what importance is it when the whole social structure, the community, the world about us, when that cannot be changed by an individual, by one human being, what significance has one individual, one human being transforming himself when around him there is so much chaos, so much misery, such confusion, such madness - if we can use that word, I think validly. I think that question is wrong because the human being is the result of the culture in which he lives. He has built the culture, the society, the environment. And in changing the human being he is changing his environment because he is the world, and the world around him is himself. There is no division between himself and

the world. I think this one must very clearly understand right from the beginning: that there is no division as the individual and the community. The word 'individual' means an entity who in himself is indivisible, not dividable, not divisible. And most human beings are divisible, are fragmented, which is partly the result of society, the culture in which he lives.

And so I think it is important that we understand this question, that the human being, as we are now, we are the result of the environment in which we live. I think that is fairly clear. If you are born in this country you are a Hindu, or a Muslim, or this or that. If you are born abroad, in the west, you are a Christian, a Catholic, Protestant and all the divisions of Catholicism and Protestantism. So the human being is the world, and the world is the human being. One may logically, intellectually accept this as an idea, as a something which appeals to reason. But there it stops because we seem to be incapable of really putting that fact into action. And we are going to, if we may this evening, not only discuss the conflict in man, and therefore in the world, conflict within himself and in his relationship with the world, conflict between the various factors of fragmentation, each fragment in opposition to other fragments of which he is made up, and whether it is possible for the human mind to be totally free from all conflict. Because then only is it possible to know what it means to love. And also then perhaps we shall also comprehend fully the full meaning of death and what living is.

So first it is necessary that we should understand what conflict does to the human mind. Please, as we said the other day, we are sharing the common problem together. This is our problem, yours and if happens to be another's, it is so, between you and the speaker

we are going to share together the problem: whether the mind can ever end its conflict. When we share together, the sharing implies partaking, not merely sharing a few set of ideas or words, but actually sharing together, investigating, exploring together. And therefore you have to take tremendous interest in it because it is your problem. And if you are not concerned with this problem there is something very wrong with you. It is like a house burning and you watching it, not doing anything about it.

Man, you, human beings right throughout the world, are in conflict, in battle with himself, with his neighbour, with the world, with the environment, of which he is part. And until we understand this problem and find out for ourselves whether there is a possibility of completely ending conflict totally then we shall never be able to live at peace with ourselves and so with society. It is only a mind that is completely peaceful, not asleep, which has not mesmerized itself into a state of what it considers peace, but actually live at peace, it is only such a mind that can find what truth is, what it means to live, what it means to die, what is the depth and the width of love.

So we are going first to enquire together why man lives in conflict, why you live in conflict. I don't know if you are aware of it, first, within yourself. How you are fragmented, broken up, which is a fact. You are a businessman, and you are a householder, the two opposites. You are an artist and at the same time as a human being you are greedy, envious, seeking power, position, prestige, fame. You are a scientist and an ordinary rather shoddy little human being. So as human beings we are fragmented. You know what that word means, broken up in ourselves. And if one is

aware of this, that one is actually fragmented, god, soul, man, virtue and non virtue, hate and love, you know, all the fragmentation, the various dualities in which we live, unless that is totally understood, not intellectually, until conflict ends our minds are incapable of perception. It is only a mind that is not tortured, that is not distorted, that is very clear, which has no markings of any kind of conflict. It is only such a mind that can see what truth is, and therefore such a mind can live.

Now if one is aware of this issue, not only within himself but socially, wars, demanding peace, the way of the politician, the way of the saints, this diversified conflict. If one is aware of it - and I hope you are, as we are talking about it now - what is the root cause of this? Is it the fault of the environment, the education that one has, the culture in which one lives, which is the environment - let's call it that. Is it the fault of the environment that man, you, are in constant battle, not only during the day but also during the night when you sleep, from the moment you are born until you die, this battle? If you are really aware of it, not intellectually, to be aware intellectually is merely to be aware of certain ideas, words. And that has no value at all. But if you are actually aware, feel that in yourself you are fragmented, broken up, contradictory, you must have asked, why? Why does man, you, live in this state? And you have created the environment, the society in which you live, the religions which you have, which you accept, the gods and all the rest of it, you have created it. Right? Your gods are your projections, or your grandfather's projections, of which you are a part. So you are responsible for the conflict and for the environment, and for the society in which you live, and all the

absurdities of religion - the beliefs, the dogma, the rituals, all the immature mind that goes into all this. You are completely, utterly responsible for the environment and for the society in which you live. So when you are aware of it - that is aware intensely, passionately, not just verbally, actually feel it, that you are the world and the world is you, then why does this conflict exist in man? You are following all this? Are we communicating with each other? I'll go on, if you don't it's up to you.

I don't know if you have asked this question of yourself, if you have, what is your answer. Do you refer to what somebody has said, why you live in conflict, either according to Marx, or to Shankaracharya, or the Buddha, defer to some authority? Do you do that when you ask yourself this question: why you, as a human being, responsible for the whole structure of the environment in which you live, of which you are a part, why there is this conflict in you? Can anybody answer this question? If they do answer it, it will be merely a description, an explanation. You are following all this? But the explanation and the description are not the described, nor the explained. Right? So you have to totally disregard authority. Right? You have to find out why you are in conflict, not according to somebody. Then if you do find out according to somebody, then you will find the answer according to that person, not the answer for yourself. Right? Is that clear?

Therefore we are going together to find out why man is in conflict, and whether that conflict can ever end totally, not at different layers. You may have an extraordinarily peaceful household, but you are at war with your neighbour, and so on. Now to find out you need energy, don't you? You need a great deal of

energy to find out for yourself the cause of this conflict. Please listen carefully, the cause. Right? Why man, you, live in conflict. Now when you enquire into the cause of it you are employing the intellect as an instrument of analysis, aren't you? Right? Are you following all this? You are using intellect as an instrument of analysis with which you hope to find the cause. You understand? The intellect is partial, is a fragment of the total. You hope to find the cause of a tremendous question like, why man is in conflict, through a fragmentary thing called the intellect which is the only instrument you have. Right? And so when you begin to enquire into the cause through the intellect your answer will be partial. Right? Because your intellect is partial, and therefore that is not the instrument. Right? Are you following all this?

Which means you must now discard the instrument to find out a different kind of instrument. Up to now we have used the intellect as an analytical means to find out why man suffers, why man is in conflict. The intellect. And the intellect is a fragment of the total. Man isn't just an intellect, there are all his nervous organisms, his emotions, his - you know the whole structure, and you take one part of it and try to use that part to find a cause. Therefore when you examine through a partial instrument your understanding will always be partial and therefore incomplete. Right? I don't know if you understand all this?

And to see that you need energy, don't you? Now energy we have divided, again fragmented. You follow? There is the energy of fragmentation. In the fragments there is energy, like hate has its own energy, and the control of that energy is also energy. Right? So we have divided energy into fragments. Whereas energy, the

human energy, the cosmic energy, every kind of energy is a unitary movement. So one has to have that energy to understand the structure and the nature of conflict, and the ending of conflict. You must have intense energy, and not fragmentary energy. The fragmentary energy is to say, "I must get rid of it. I must get rid of conflict". Who is the 'I' who says, "I must get rid of it", or suppress it? It is one part of that energy discarding another part of energy. So energies are in conflict. You are following?

So we are asking what is the reason of this conflict. One can observe it very simply as the observer and the observed. Right? There is in you the observer, and you observe. Right? You observe the tree as an observer. The observer watches that tree with all his knowledge, his past conditioning. He looks at that tree as something separate from himself. Right? Just listen to it, don't agree, or disagree. You haven't gone into this question at all, so you have to first find out what the speaker has to say, and when you are listening to what the speaker is saying watch yourself. Don't merely listen to the speaker, that is absolutely useless. But use the speaker to watch yourself. Then you will see in yourself there is the observer and the observed always. The observer says, "Do this, don't do that". The observer has certain values, certain judgements, he is really the censor who is always watching, denying, controlling, separating himself from that which he is watching. Right?

When you are angry, or jealous, or not generous, which most people are, in that, if you observe it very closely there is the observer who says, "I am jealous; I am angry". Right? The naming of the reaction which he calls anger separates him. Right? Which

is, can you look at that tree without naming, without the interference of thought, which is the response of memory, just to observe? We talked about it briefly the other day. Which is, you look at that tree through the image which you have about that tree, which means you are not really looking at the tree. Right? In the same way when you have an image about your wife or husband or your friend, you are not looking at the friend but looking at the friend through the image that you have. So there is duality. Right? This division between the observer and the observed is the very essence of conflict. The division. You haven't understood, I'll show it to you.

It is all rather infantile all this, one has finished with all this but one has to go through it. When I am angry, at the moment of anger there is no observer. Please follow this. I am going to go into it step by step. Follow it by observing yourself, not what the speaker is pointing out, then you are outside and not inside. So observe yourself, what takes place? When you are angry, at the moment of experiencing that anger, or any other experience, at that second there is no observer. A second later the observer comes and says, "I have been angry". Right? He has separated himself from anger. He has named it, named the feeling as anger. He has named it to strengthen his memory. Please follow this. Because his memory says, you have been angry. The memory is the censor. The memory says, you should not have been angry, be kind, don't hit him back, turn the other cheek. So the response of memory as thought becomes the observer, and so there is a division between the observer and the observed. When he says, "I am angry, I am jealous, I am envious", then the conflict begins because he wants to

suppress envy, or enlarge it, take delight in it. So where there is the observer and the observed there is the root of conflict. Right?

So is there an observation of anger without the observer? That is the next question. You follow, that is the next question. Because that is our habit. At the moment of anger, or of any pleasure, there is no observer. Then a second later comes the observer. The observer is the censor, is the recorder, is the memory, is the brain cells in which these memories are held. And hence that observer says, "I should not", or "I should", "I want more", "I want less". You have understood this? So one asks then, can there be an observation without the observer? You understand, this is a tremendous question, please follow this up. Because we are used, we are conditioned to this conflict which arises when there is an observer different from the thing observed. That's our tradition, that's our conditioning, that's the result of our culture - god and man, you follow, all that, division. And when we function from habit it is a waste of energy. I don't know if you are following all this.

And when we immediately respond, that is when the observer immediately responds to an emotional, or a reaction, the response is always the old. Right? It is the old brain responding. So we are asking whether there is an observation without the observer. Now to end any habit, any tradition, without conflict needs energy. You are following this? Look, sirs, let's make it simple. I am angry, at the moment of anger there is no observer as the I who says, "I am angry". A second later the entity as the observer comes into being, who is the censor, who says, "I must not be angry". The response of the observer is traditional, is the habit, is the old brain responding.

And that constant response of the old brain is a waste of energy. And you need energy totally to observe without the observer. Are you doing all this? Are you sharing, are we sharing together what we are talking about? All right.

Let's put the whole question differently, because I see you are not following this at all. Look, sir, what is our life? The daily life, not the ideological life, not the life you would like to lead, not the life that you hope to have, not in the future, but the actual daily 'what is'. What is your life? It is a battle, isn't it, with occasional flashes of pleasure, whether it be sexual or other forms of sensuous pleasures. Our life is a constant battle. Can that battle end? Because what we are we make up the world. Now to end that battle you must look at the whole field of existence, not partially, but totally. You understand? Totally meaning the sorrow, the physical pain, the insults, the fears, the hopes, the anxieties, the ambitions, the regrets, the ambitions, the competitive aggressive brutal existence. See the whole of it, not just parts of it. Right? We are used to seeing parts of it, not take the whole field and look. We are not capable, as we are, to observe this whole field as one, because we have divided life into business, family life and religious life, you know the division that goes on. And each division has its own activity of energy. And therefore each fragment is against the other fragment. And these fragmentary energies are wasting our total energy. Right?

Now is it possible to look at this whole field, this complex existence, the economic side, the social side, the family side, the personal, the communal, you know, the whole of it, as one, perceiving it totally? To perceive it totally you must have a mind

that is non-fragmented. Right? Now how do you come about a mind that is so fragmented, to throw away all the fragments and have a perception that is total? You have understood my question? I cannot see the whole complex existence through a little hole which I call the intellect. I cannot see it because the intellect is a part, and you cannot use the part to understand the whole. That is a simple, logical, fact. There must be a different kind of perception. Right? And that quality of perception exists only when the observer is absent. When you can look at that tree without the image, when you can look at your wife and your husband, and all the rest of it, without any image whatsoever. Then you can look at a Muslim, and the Muslim can look at you, without the image.

And these images are the reason for conflict. These images are produced by the observer. Now if you see the truth of it, not the logical sequence of it, but see the fact of it, the truth of it, like when you see the danger of a snake you act instantly. So when you see the truth that conflict exists as long as there is an observer, and the observer is the producer of images, he is the tradition, he is the conditioned being, he is the censor. If you see that, not as an idea, but actually, then you will observe without the observer, then you will see the totality of existence. And therefore a mind that sees this has tremendous energy. Because energy then is not dissipated. Right, you are following it? We dissipate energy through control. Have you ever watched a sannyasi, or a monk who has taken vows of celibacy, poverty, have you ever watched him, talked to him? What tortures he goes through. Right? Because he has got the image that only truth, or whatever that sublime thing is, can be found if he is celibate. Because he says, that is a wastage of energy,

sexual wastage of energy, therefore you must have complete energy to find reality. But in himself he is in battle. Right, you have understood this? Oh lord, come on sirs.

So he has an image that he should be a celibate, and the image creates a division between himself and actually 'what is'. Now if you can observe actually 'what is', without a censor, there is a transformation of 'what is'. I'll show it to you.

One is violent. That is apparently the normal human factor, to be violent. I am violent. At the moment of violence there is no observer. Then a few second later the observer comes into being, he says, "I should not be violent". Follow this please, follow it carefully. "I should not be violent", because he has an image of non-violence, an ideal of non-violence which prevents him from observing violence. Right? So I say to myself, "I will be everyday less and less violent". Right? "I will ultimately reach a state of non-violence, day by day". Now what is implied in that simple fact? That is, I am violent, and I will be non-violent one day. What is implied in that? First there is the observer and the observed. Second he is sowing the seeds of violence, in the meantime before he arrives at the state of non-violence - right, you are following this? - he is sowing the seeds of violence. Then there is the factor of time before he can be completely non-violent. That is, the space between violence and non-violence, in that space several other factors happen. So he is never free of violence. You can see this. People who talk endlessly about non-violence are really extraordinarily violent people, because they are always pretending eventually they will come to non-violence. In the meantime there are violent. So the fact is violence. The 'what is' is violence. And I

can observe it - there is an observation only when the mind isn't pursuing the ideal of non-violence. Right? You are following this? It can then observe 'what is'.

Now how do you observe 'what is'? Do you observe it with your conditioned mind, as saying "I must not be violent", with the image which you have about violence? Or is there an observation without the word, without the image? To observe without the image requires tremendous energy. Right? Then you are not wasting energy by suppressing violence, or transforming violence, or pursuing an ideal of non-violence. That is all a wastage of energy. Right?

Now in the same way let us look at this whole problem of what is called love. That is, we have looked at what we considered living, which is a shoddy affair, a battle. And by investigating we have seen that it is possible, not intellectually, actually, to be free of battle, conflict. Now let us enquire deeply into this question of what is love. Not your opinion, or somebody's opinion, or conclusion. What actually it is now. What is love? Is it pleasure? Is it desire? Is it sex? Is it jealousy, possessiveness, domination, dependency? Is it? If you depend then you are caught in fear. Right? If I depend on my wife because she gives me pleasure, sexual or otherwise, if I depend on her for comfort, companionship, that dependency breeds fear, that dependency breeds jealousy, hatred, antagonism, possessiveness, the desire to dominate. Is all that love? Question it sirs, go into it, find out.

And is pleasure associated with sex, is it love? And why has sex become so extraordinarily important in life? Why, sirs? Why in the modern world, and also in the ancient world, why have we made

sex into such a colossal affair? Why have we said that you cannot possibly attain reality, enlightenment, if you are sexual? No answer. Let's find out.

First of all you have to enquire into what is pleasure. You see a beautiful tree, a lovely cloud, the face of a child that is enchanting, a face of a man or a woman that is beautiful, you see it. Then what takes place? You see a lovely moonlight on the water, sparkling, with such beauty. You perceive it. Then at that moment of tremendous experience thought comes along and says, "How lovely that was, I want it repeated tomorrow". Are you following all this? Thought, which is the response of a memory, which is the experience of seeing that moonlight on the water, the beauty of it, that has been recorded, and thought says, "I must repeat that thing again". You are following all this? Which means at that moment of perception of that light on the water there was nothing, there was neither pleasure, nor the demand that it must happen tomorrow. There was absolute realization of that beauty. Then thought comes in and says, "Let's repeat it. Go back tomorrow evening, and look at that water again." So that is pleasure. The repetition of an event which thought has reduced to pleasure. And so thought can continue and give strength to pleasure. You have to understand this, please. You follow? There has been physical pain, bad toothache, pain, last week. You are frightened that it comes back again tomorrow, next week. Which is the action of thought. You follow? Thought sustains both pleasure and fear. So thought has built this whole structure round love as pleasure. And therefore all the edicts, the sanctions of religions which say, don't look at a woman, therefore suppress, control, which is what takes place?

That's a battle. You follow? That is wasting energy much more.

So what is love? Is it pleasure? Is it fear? Fear is jealousy, violence. When you possess your wife, as my wife, is that not violent? And is that love? And as we asked, why is it human beings have made sex into an extraordinary affair? Must not, or must. Have you ever thought about it? When you observe why in your own life that has become of such significant importance. So let's go into it.

Have you noticed how your life is mechanical? Go to the office everyday, for the next forty years, repeat, repeat, how extraordinarily mechanical you are. When you quote your religious books, the rituals, when you call yourself a Hindu, a Muslim, a Christian, and god knows what else, a communist, it is a mechanical habit, a routine, a repetition. When you name yourself as a beaurocrat, as a politician, as a sociologist and so on, it is a habit, a mechanical acquisition of knowledge which you can repeat, repeat. Isn't your life mechanical? Haven't you noticed it? So what have you? Your life, your thinking, your ways of acting, are all mechanical, repetitive. So you have only one thing which is non-repetitive, which you can release through repetitiveness, which is sex. So that becomes your release from the mechanical way of life. Right? Come on sirs. Do enquire. Don't bother who is going. You are so interested in who is going, for god's sake.

So you have made love into a mechanical, pleasurable affair, and is that love? You know to find out what it is you have to deny completely what it is not. You have to deny - the denial is the understanding of what pleasure and fear is. The understanding of it, not saying, "Well, I mustn't have pleasure", which is sheer

nonsense. It is like a man saying, "I must have no desire". That's what you are trained to do, that is what you accept by your tradition. That denial is completely wrong, you must go beyond it. You know when you look at a tree, the beauty of a leaf, the shadow, the movement of the leaf, to look at it is a delight. What is wrong with it? Because you have denied beauty your life has become mechanical. You never look at a tree, on the contrary you are cutting down trees. You never look at the sky, the clouds, the beauty of the land because you have an idea at the back of your mind that to be a really religious man you must never look at anything beautiful, because beauty might remind you of the woman. It is so disgusting, so childish. And that is what you call religion. And that is the way you are going to find god. It is such infantilism, because you torture the mind to find god. Think of that! To find reality you must have a free mind, not a tortured mind. There must be this sense of love, not with all its jealousies, fears, pleasures - you follow? You don't know what it means to love, the beauty of it. Because you don't know what it means to live a beautiful life, a life without conflict. You only know a life which is committed to some form or another, and therefore broken up - as you have broken up living from dying. Right? See what is involved in it.

There is death far away, put it away from you, and you jolly well know it is going to come one of these days. So you invent theories, reincarnation. You follow? Is there next life? If you really believe in reincarnation, really believe in it, that is, that you will be born next life according to what you do this life. Right? Therefore this life matters much more than next life, which means what you

do now matters, how you behave now matters - if you believe in reincarnation. But you really don't believe in it. It means absolutely nothing, it is just a theory, because it gives you temporary comfort, and you say, that must be so. If you really in your heart of hearts believed in the thing, then every minute of the day counts. Every action has significance. Therefore now is the moment of righteousness, not next life. I don't know if you understand all this. You have got innumerable shoddy theories about death, and you have never faced it.

So we are going to look at it to find out the nature of death, while living, full of vitality, energy, not when you are diseased, unconscious, in pain, in misery, crippled up, then that is not the moment to find out what death is. While you are capable of walking, looking, observing, being aware of the world outside and inside, when you have understood what living is, and what it means to love. It doesn't matter whether it is a tree, or a dog, or a woman, or a beautiful sky of an evening. So what is death? You know this question. The old people put this question out of fear because they are going to die. The old generation offer you nothing but theories about death. They have nothing to offer you, either traditionally or actually. What have they offered you culturally, socially, economically, what have they offered you? Do look at it, sir. What have they given you? A social structure that is so corrupt, so full of injustice, a structure that breeds war, nationalism, and all the rest of the things the older generation have offered you. And any intelligent man, sensitive, alive, young, discards it totally. Their morality also.

So what have they to offer you, the old generation, who are so

frightened of death? Nothing, except a lot of words and fear. So don't accept what another says about death. Let's find out what it means.

What does it mean to die? Not in old age, crippled and diseased, or by an accident, sitting here, conscious, aware, listening, with a mind that is really serious, as it was serious when it enquired into what love is, and what living is? Now we are asking what it is to die, having no fear, because you don't know what it means to die. You only know what it means to end. You understand? To end, not what it means to die. That is, the ending of what you know, your accumulated knowledge, your insults, your hopes, your family, your wife, your children, whom you think you love, whom you don't really. If you really loved your children you would have a different world.

So what does it mean to die? Not the ending of the known, which causes fear, because that is all what you are afraid of, ending the known, not of death of which you know nothing. So what is it that you are frightened of? Frightened of ending the known, and what is the known? Please go with me a little bit. What is the known? All your memories, the collection of your worries, the furniture, the house, the accumulated insults and worries and conflicts and sorrow, and you hold on to that and say, "Please, I don't want to die". Isn't that what you are afraid of? Afraid of letting go the known, not of death. Now if you let go of the known, that is, let go of some memory that you have, let go completely the pleasures that you had, the accumulated memories, the regrets, the anxiety, die to it completely, so that your mind is totally fresh. That's what it means to die. So that you don't carry over all the

memories, the shoddy experiences, all the pleasurable experiences, end each day with every accumulation. And you will know what it means to die so completely that your mind is fresh tomorrow, young and innocent, and full of that energy. Without that, do what you will, without love, without the understanding of the beauty of this dying you will never come near that which is unnameable.

BANGALORE 2ND PUBLIC TALK 31ST JANUARY 1971 'MIND IN MEDITATION'

What is our daily living? If you can bear to look at it, if you can observe it, what is actually our everyday life? One can see that in that living there is a great deal of confusion, there is a great deal of conformity, contradiction, where every man is against another man, where in the business world you are ready to cut another's throat. Politically, sociologically, morally there is a great deal of confusion. And when you look at your own life you see that from the moment you are born until you die, it is a series of conflicts. Life has become a battlefield. Please observe it, not that you must agree with the speaker, or disagree with him, but just observe it. Just watch your actual daily living. And when you do so observe, you cannot help seeing what actually is going on: how one is in despair, lonely, unhappy, in conflict, caught in a series of competitions, aggressions, brutality, violence - that is actually our daily life. And that we call living. And not being able to understand it, or resolve it, or go beyond it, we escape from it into some ideology, into the ideology of some ancient philosophers, ancient teachers, ancient wisdom, and we think by escaping from the actual we have solved everything. And that is why philosophy, ideals, all the various forms of networks of escapes have not in any way resolved our problems; we are just as we were five thousand years ago or more, dull, repetitive, bitter, angry, violent, aggressive, with occasional flash of some beauty, happiness, and always frightened of that one thing which we call death.

And our daily life has no beauty, because again your religious

teachers, your books, have said, "Don't have any desires, be desireless, don't look at a woman - because you might be tempted. And to find god, truth, you must be a celibate". And our daily life is contrary to all the sayings of the teachers; we are actually what we are - very petty, small, narrow minded, frightened human beings. And without changing that any amount of your seeking truth, or talking valiantly and most scholarly, or interpreting your Gita and the innumerable sacred books, has no value at all. So you might just as well throw away all the sacred books and start all over again, because they with their interpreters, their teachers, their gurus, have not brought enlightenment to you. Their authority, their compulsive discipline, their sanctions have no meaning at all. So you might just as well put them all aside and learn from yourself, for therein lies truth, not the truth of another.

So first is it possible to change our lives? Because our lives are in disorder, our lives are in fragmentation - being something at the office, go to the temple, if you are still inclined that way, something entirely different with the family, and in front of a big official you become, god knows, a frightened, desperate, sycophantic human being. And can we change all this? Because without changing our daily life, your asking what truth is, if there is a god or not, has no meaning whatsoever, because we are fragmented human beings, broken up; and until we are a total human entity, whole, complete, then only is there a possibility of coming upon that something which is timeless.

So first we must look at our life. Now how do you look at your life? Please follow this a little bit. We will make it as simple as possible because this is a very, very complex problem. And a very

complex problem of existence must be approached very simply, not with all your theories, opinions and judgements because they have not helped at all. All your religious conclusions have no meaning. So we must be able to look at this life which one leads every day, able to see it exactly as it is. And that is going to be our difficulty, that is to observe.

Now what does that word 'observe' mean? There is not only the sensory perception with the eye. You see this bougainvillaea, sensory perception, then - please follow this step by step - then as you observe that colour then you make an image, you have already an image, you have a name for it, you like it or dislike it, you have preference. So the images that you have about that flower, that is, through that image you see it, you don't actually see it but your mind sees it more than the eye. Right? Please do understand this very simple fact, that we look not only at nature, which is being destroyed by human beings, pollution and all the rest of it that is going on in this terrible world, we not only look at nature with the eyes that have accumulated knowledge about nature, and therefore with an image, we also look at human beings with our various forms of conclusions, opinions, judgements and values. That is, you are a Hindu, another is a Pakistan, Muslim. You are a Catholic, another is a Protestant, Communist and so on and on and on - the division. So when you look, when you observe yourself, your life, you observe it through the image, through the conclusions that you have already formed. You say, "This is good", or "This is bad"? or "This should be" and "That should not be". You are following all this? So you are looking, observing with the images, conclusions that you have formed, and therefore you are not actually looking at

life. You understand this very simple fact?

So in order to look at our life as it is there must be freedom of observation. You must not look at it as a Hindu, as a bureaucrat, as a family man, as a - god knows what else! You must look at it with freedom. You understand? And that is the difficulty. You look at your life, the despair, the agony, the sorrow, this vast struggle, you look at it all with eyes that have said, and ears that have said, "This must change into something else", "This must be transformed in order to make it more beautiful". So actually when you are doing that you are not directly in relationship with what you see. Right? Are you following this? Not the explanation which the speaker is giving but actually observing your life, actually observing how you look at it. Whether you look at it with your image, with your conclusions and therefore not looking at it but looking through the past images and therefore not coming directly in contact with it. Right? So when you look at life, that is, the life of your daily existence, not the theoretical life, not the abstract life which says, "All human beings are one, all love" - you know, all that tommy rot! But actually when you observe it you see that you are looking with your past knowledge, with all the images, the traditions, the accumulation of all human experience which prevents you from looking. That is a fact which must be realized, that to observe actually your life you must look at it afresh. That is to look at it without any condemnation, without any ideals, without any desire to suppress it or change it, just to observe it.

Are you doing this? Are you using the speaker as a mirror in which you are seeing your own life? And because you are seeing it with conclusions it prevents you from looking at it directly, being

in contact with it. Right? Are you doing it? Not that you will do it when you go home, because if you don't do it now you won't do it later. If you are not doing it then don't bother to listen. Look at the sky, look at that tree, look at the beauty of the light, look at the clouds with their curve, with their delicacy. If you look at it without any image you have understood your own life.

So that is, you are looking at yourself, at your life as an observer and your life as something to be observed. Right? There is a division between the observer and the observed. Isn't that simple? That is, you are looking at your life. You as an observer, something separate from your life. Right? So there is a division between the observer and the observed. Now this division is the essence of all conflict, essence of all struggle, pain, fear, despair. That is, where there is a division between human beings, the division of nationalities, the division of religions, social divisions, wherever there is a division there must be conflict. This is law, this is reason, logic. There is Pakistan on one side and India on the other, battling with each other; you are a Brahmin and another is a non-Brahmin and hate, division. So that externalized division with all its conflict is the same as the inward division, as the observer and the observed. You have understood this? If you don't understand this, you can't go much further because a mind that is in conflict cannot possibly ever understand what truth is. Because a mind in conflict is a tortured mind, a twisted mind, a distorted mind and how can such a mind be free to observe the beauty of the earth, or the beauty of the sky, the tree, the beauty of a child or a beautiful woman or a man; and the beauty of extreme sensitivity and all that is involved in it. So without understanding this basic principle, not as an ideal,

as a fact that you are inevitably going to have conflict.

And so the question is, the next question: what is this observer? - you understand? The observer who has separated himself from the observed. Please this is not a philosophy, an intellectual affair, a thing which you can discuss, deny, agree or disagree; it is something that you see yourself, and therefore it is yours, not the speaker's. We see that when you are angry, at the moment of anger there is no observer, at the moment of experiencing anything there is no observer. When you look at that sunset, and that sunset is something immense, when you look at it at that moment there is no observer who says, "I am seeing the sunset". A second later comes the observer. That is, you are angry, at the moment of anger there is no observer, no experiencer, there is only that state of anger; a second later comes the observer who says, "I should not have been angry", or the observer says, "I was justified in being angry" - a second later not at the moment of anger, then is the beginning of division. You understand?

So how does this happen? At the moment of experience there is the total absence of the observer, and how does it happen that a second later the observer comes into being. Right? You are putting the question, not I, not the speaker, put it for yourself and you will find the answer. You understand sir, you have got to work.

Because this is your life, and if you say, "Well I have learned something from the speaker", then you have learned absolutely nothing. You have just collected a few words and those few words put together becomes the idea. Ordered thought is idea, and we are not talking about ideas, we are not talking about a new philosophy. Philosophy means the love of truth in daily life, not the truth of

some philosophical mind that invents.

So how does this observer come into being? That is, sir, when you look at this flower, at the moment you observe it closely there is no observer, there is only a looking; then you begin to name that flower. Right? Then you say, "I wish I had it in my garden, or in my house". Then you have already begun to build an image about that flower. So the image-maker is the observer. Right? Are you following all this? Watch it in yourself please. So the image and the image-maker is the observer, and the observer is the past, the 'me' as the observer is the past, the 'me' is the knowledge which I have accumulated, knowledge of pain, sorrow, suffering, agony, despair, loneliness, jealousy, the tremendous anxiety that one goes through, that is all the 'me', which is the accumulated knowledge of the observer, which is the past. Right? So when you observe, the observer looks at that flower with the eyes of the past. And you don't know how to look without the observer and therefore you bring about conflict.

So our question is: can you look, not only at the flower, but at your life, at your agony, at your despair, your sorrow, can you look at it without naming it, without saying to yourself, "I must go beyond it", "I must suppress it" - just to look at it without the observer. Do it please as we are talking now. That is, take your particular form, or particular tendency, or take, which most people are, envy. All right, let's take that. You know what envy is, don't you, very well? You are very familiar with that. Envy is comparison. The measurement of thought comparing what you are with what should be, or with what you want to become. So you know what envy is. So just look, take it. Now when that reaction

comes into being, that is you are envious of your neighbour who has got a bigger car, better house, is an awful politician - you know, all the rest of it. And you look at that and you suddenly feel envious. That is, you have compared yourself with him, and envy is born. Now you have that envy, you know what that feeling is. Now can you look at that feeling without saying, "That is right", or wrong, without naming it? Without saying that it is envy. To look at it without any image, then you go beyond it. You have understood? Instead of struggling with envy, that you should or should not, that you must suppress it, and so on, without going through all that struggle and nonsense, without any meaning, observe your anger, your envy, without naming it, because the naming is the movement of the past memory which justifies or condemns. But if you can look at it without naming then you will see that you go beyond it.

So the moment you know the possibility of going beyond 'what is', you are full of energy. Right? It is the man who doesn't know how to go beyond 'what is', because he doesn't know how to deal with it, therefore he is afraid, he escapes. Then seeing the impossibility of it, such a person loses energy. You understand this sirs? If you have a problem and can solve it, then you have energy. A man who has a thousand problems and doesn't know what to do with them, he loses his energy. So in the same way, look at your life, what it is, ugly, petty, shallow, extraordinarily violent. These are all words to describe what is actually going on, not only the violence in sex but violence that abides with power, position, prestige. Now look at it with eyes that don't immediately jump with images.

Now that is your life. And look at your life in which there is what you call love. What is love? We are not discussing the theories of what love should be. We are observing what we call love. I love my wife. I love my - I don't know what you love. I doubt if you love anything at all. You know what it means to love? Is love pleasure? Is love jealousy? Can a man love who is ambitious? He may sleep with his wife, beget a few children; and the man who is struggling politically to become an important person, or in the business world, or in the religious world also, you understand, when he wants to become a saint, when he wants to become desireless. Now all that is part of ambition, aggression, desire. Can a man who is competitive love? And you are all competitive, aren't you? Better job, better position, better house, more noble ideas, more perfect images of yourself - you know all that business you go through and is that love? Can you love when you are going through all this tyranny, when you can dominate your wife, or your husband, or your children, when you are seeking power, is there a possibility of love? So in negating what is not love, there is love. You understand? You understand sirs? You have to negate everything which is not love, which is, no ambition, no competition, no aggression, no violence, either in speech, or in act, or in thought. Now when you negate that which is not love, then you will know what love is. And love is something that is intense, that you feel very strongly; love is not pleasure, therefore one must understand pleasure, not one's aim to love somebody, understand pleasure.

So if you can observe your life you will find out for yourself what love is because in that lies great passion, not love, passion.

The word 'passion' comes from sorrow, the root meaning of that word 'passion' is sorrow. You know what it means to suffer? Not how to escape from suffering, or what to do about suffering, but to suffer, to have great pain inwardly. You understand? Then when there is no movement of escape from that sorrow out of that comes great passion, which is compassion.

And you must also find out what death is, not at the last minute, not when you are sick, unconscious, diseased, incapable of clarity, observing; that happens to everybody, old age, disease and death. But while you are young, fresh, active, going to your beastly offices every day, returning to your particular little prison of a family, to find out while you are active, alive, what death means. The organism does go away, wear out, like old age, it is natural. It can last longer depending on the kind of life one leads, depending whether your life is a battlefield from the moment you are born until you die, then your body is worn out quicker, your heart goes through tension, through emotional tension the heart becomes weaker. This is an established fact. And while one is active to find out what the meaning and the significance of death means. And to find that out there must be no fear. And most of us are frightened of death, frightened of leaving the things that we have known. Please do listen to all this. Frightened of leaving your family, frightened of the things you have accumulated, of letting them go, your knowledge, your books, your office, you know what you have collected. And not knowing what is going to happen when you die the mind then, which is thought, says there must be a different kind of life, life must continue somehow, my life, your individual life. And you have then the whole structure of belief, reincarnation, you

call it, don't you? Have you ever looked at what it is to incarnate. That is, next life. You understand? What is it that is to be reborn next life? All your accumulations of your knowledge. Right? All your thoughts. All the activities. All the goodness, or the evil or the ugly things that you have done because what you do now that is going to react next life. Right? You all believe that most hopefully, don't you? Which means, if you really believe it then that matter is what you do now, how you behave now, what your conduct is now, because next life you are going to pay for it. That is if you believe in all this - karma.

So if you are really caught in the network of this belief then you must pay complete attention to your life now, what you do, what you think, how you treat another. But you don't believe so vastly, so deeply. That is just a comfort, an escape, a worthless word. And to find out what it means to die, not physically that is inevitable, but to die. That is, to die to everything that is known, to die to your family, to your attachments, to all the things that you have accumulated, the known, the known pleasures, the known fears, die to it every minute and you will see what it means to die so that the mind is made fresh, young and therefore innocent. So that in you there is the incarnation of the next life, but the next day. You understand? To incarnate the next day is far more important than in the future. So that your mind is astonishingly innocent. Innocent, the word 'innocence' means a mind that is incapable of being hurt. You understand sir, the beauty of it: a mind that can never be hurt. And such a mind is an innocent mind. Therefore a mind that has been hurt must die to the hurts everyday so that it comes the next morning with a fresh clear unspotted mind, it has no scars. That is

the way to live. That is not a theory, it is for you to do it.

So there must be the understanding of oneself completely.

There must be this order which is not habit, which is not practice, which is not the cultivation of some virtue. Virtue comes into being like a flower of goodness when you understand disorder in your life. Out of disorder comes order.

Then you can begin to enquire: what is that which man has sought throughout the centuries upon centuries, he has been asking for it, trying to discover it? You cannot possibly understand it, or come upon it if you have not laid the foundation in your daily life. And then we can ask: what is meditation? Not how to meditate or what steps to take to meditate, or what systems and methods to follow to meditate, because all systems, all systems, all methods make the mind mechanical. You understand sir? Meditation is the most marvellous thing if you know the meaning of a mind that is in meditation, not how to meditate. We will see what is not meditation - you understand - then you will know what meditation is. What it is not, through negation you come upon the positive. But if you pursue the positive it leads you to a dead end.

We say meditation is not the practice of any system; you know people who sit and become aware of their toes, of their bodies, of their movements, you know practise, practise, practise. A machine can do that. So systems cannot reveal the beauty and the depth and the marvellous thing called meditation. Nor is meditation concentration. When you concentrate, or attempt to concentrate, in that concentration there is the observer and the observed.

So no system, no method, no concentration and a mind that has understood all this through negation. Such a mind then becomes

very quiet naturally. In that there is no observer who has achieved some kind of silence. In that silence there is the emptying of the mind of all the past. Unless you do this in your daily life you won't understand the marvellous subtleties, the beauty, the extraordinary thing of it, unless you do it. Merely to repeat what the speaker says, don't do it. If you repeat it becomes a propaganda, which is a lie.

So when the mind has this complete order, mathematical order, and that order has come into being naturally through the understanding of the disorder of our daily life, then the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet. This quiet has vast space, not the quiet of a little room, it is not the quiet, the silence of the ending of noise, but a mind that has understood this whole problem of existence, love and death and the living, the beauty of the skies, the trees, the people, the beauty, which all your religious gurus have denied, and that is why you destroy your trees, your nature. When you have understood all this then you will know what happens in that silence. Nobody can describe it. Anybody who describes it doesn't know what it is. It is for you to find out.