



Lost And Found

[Action Without Conflict, 1966](#)

[Unconditioning And Simplicity, 1966](#)

[Conversation With Huston Smith, 1968](#)
[Is it Possible to Live with Total Lucidity?](#)

[Talk With Young People About Desire, Pain And](#)
[Pleasure, Paris 1969](#)

[Conversation With Swami Venkatesananda, Saanen](#)
[1969](#)

[Can One Experience The Infinite?](#)

[Can The Human Mind Be Free From Its Conditioning,](#)
[Rome 1969](#)

ACTION WITHOUT CONFLICT, MARCH, 1966

I think the more one observes the world's condition, the more it becomes clear that there must be a totally different kind of action. One sees in the world, including in India, the confusion, the great sorrow, the misery, the starvation, the general decline. One is aware of this, one knows it from newspapers, reading magazines, books, but it remains on the intellectual level because we don't seem to be able to do anything about it. Human beings are in despair, there is great sorrow in themselves, frustration. And there is chaos about one, the more you observe and go into it, not intellectually, not verbally but actually discuss, observe, act, enquire, examine, the more you see how confused human beings are. They are lost. And those who think they are not lost because they belong to a particular group, a circle, and feel the more you practise, the more you do certain things, the more you do social work, or this or that, the more they are sure that the world is going to be saved by their particular little actions. The world is at war, and you think by particular prayer, a few people gathered together repeating certain words, will solve this enormous question which has remained unsolved for over five thousand years, by words, prayer. And you keep on repeating, knowing that wars can never be stopped that way.

So each one belongs to a certain groups, to a certain political party, to a religious sect and so on, and remains in it, more and more holding on to the past, to what has been. And one is caught in this. One admits, when it is pointed out, that there is chaos, general decline, degeneration, outwardly and inwardly, and one realizes

man is lost. And without finding out why he is lost, why there is so much chaos, misery, without examining it, going into it very deeply, we answer superficially, saying that we are not following god, or that we don't love - give superficial platitudinous answers that have no value at all.

And during these talks, if one has listened to them at all, one must have come to the question, why, why this mess, why this confusion. If you enquire very deeply, you will find, I think, that man is lazy. The chaos is brought about through man's laziness, indifference, sluggishness. Because he accepts, because that's the easiest way to live, to accept, to adjust to the environment, to the condition, to the culture in which he lives, just to accept it. And this acceptance breeds dreadful laziness. And I think it is important to understand this, that we are as human beings very lazy. We think we have solved the problem of living by a belief, by saying, I believe in this or that. That belief essentially is based on fear and therefore the incapacity to solve that fear, which indicates deep rooted laziness. You observe in yourself, you fall into a pattern of thought, of action, and there you remain, because that's the easiest way, you don't have to think. You have thought a little bit about it perhaps and now you don't have to think, you are there, you are carried along by outward events, or by the push of your own little group. That gives you a great deal of satisfaction, you think you are doing extraordinarily good work. And you daren't question it because that is very disturbing, you daren't question your religion, your community, your beliefs, the social structure, nationalism, war. You accept. Please look into yourself, because we are so lazy, and this chaos is due to this laziness because we have ceased to

question, ceased to doubt, not accept.

And being conscious of this terrible mess that is going on outwardly and inwardly we expect some outward event to bring about order. Or we hope some leader in a guru, or this or that authority will help us out. And that way we have lived for centuries upon centuries, looking to somebody else to solve our problems. And to follow another may be a sense of indolence - he has probably thought out a little bit, or has little visions, or can do this or that, and he tells you what to do, and you are quite satisfied. What we really want in this world is satisfaction, comfort, somebody to tell us what to do, which all indicates this deep rooted laziness, that we don't want to think out our problems, look at it, wipe out all the difficulties.

And this indolence prevents us, not only from questioning, enquiring and examining, it prevents us from a much deeper issue. Which is, to find out what is action. The world is in chaos, we are in misery, all the solutions, the doctrines, the beliefs, the meditative circus that goes on in the name of meditation, none of them have solved a thing. And if we could find out for ourselves what is action, because we have to act, you have to do something vital, energetic, forceful to bring about a different mind, a different quality of existence. So one has to go into this question of what is action, not right action and wrong action, because if you approach action as right and wrong you are already lost. Because people will tell you, this is the right action and that is the wrong action, and you, already inclined to be lazy, don't want to enquire into it deeply, and because that person says it is right action and he is a successful lawyer, businessman, or a guru, or a politician, and you

follow him.

So what we are going to do this evening if we can, is to find out what is action. And please bear in mind we are not thinking in terms of right or wrong, there is only action, not right and wrong, not action according to the Gita, the Bible, or Koran, or god knows what else - the communists, the socialists and all the rest of that. There is only action, which is living. If one can find out the way of life, how to live, not the method - if you have method, a system, a practice, you have already encouraged this innate indolence. So one has to have a very sharp mind not to be caught in this trap which indolence is too willing to follow, fall into.

And please, if I may suggest, listen to what is being said, and listen not only to the speaker but to the noise of the world, listen to the cry of human hearts, listen to the chaos, listen to your own misery, the uncertainty, the cry of despair. If you know how to listen, then you will solve the problem. When you listen to your agony, if you listen to it, you will find the answer, you will be out of it; but you cannot listen to it if you say, the answer must be according to my pleasure, according to my desire - then you are not listening, you are only listening to the promptings of your own desire and pleasure. Please listen to find out, because we are going to something that requires a great deal of attention, quiet enquiry, hesitant examination, not, tell me what to do and I will do it. Because everything is falling to pieces around us and there must be action of a totally different kind. Not action according to anybody, even according to the speaker, we are going in to find out for ourselves what is action, how to live, because living is action. Our living we have made it so chaotic, so miserable, so immature, and

to find action there must be a great deal of maturity, not in terms of time, not maturing like a fruit on a tree, taking six months. If you take six months to mature you have already sown the seeds of misery. You have already planted hate, violence which will lead to war. So you have to mature immediately. And you will if you are capable of listening, and therefore learning.

Learning is not an additive process, that is, learning, adding, which becomes knowledge, and from that knowledge act. That's what we do. We have experiences, beliefs, thoughts, and these experiences, thoughts, ideas, have become knowledge, and from that stored knowledge we act, and therefore there is no learning at all, we are just adding, adding, adding. And we have added to ourselves this enormous knowledge for two million years. And yet we are at war, we hate, there is never a moment of peace, tranquillity, there is no ending of sorrow. Knowledge is necessary in the field of technology, in the field of skill, but if you have knowledge which is idea, and from that idea act, you have already ceased to learn.

So there is maturity not in terms of time and evolution, but maturity that comes when there is this act of learning. It's only a mature mind that can listen, be very attentive, and have a quiet mind. It's the immature mind that believes, that says, it is right and wrong, and pursues something illogically.

So we are going to learn together about action. What is action? To act, to do. All action is relationship, there is no isolated action. Action as we know now is the relationship of doing with the idea. Surely. The idea and the doing of that idea. It's excellent in the field of skill and technology, but becomes an impediment to learn

about relationship which is constantly changing. Your wife, your husband, is never the same, but laziness, the desire for comfort, security, says, I know him, he must be that way. So you have fixed the poor man, or the woman. And therefore your relationship is according to an image or to an idea, and from that image, idea, of relationship springs action. That's all we know as action. I believe, I have principles, this is right, this is wrong, this should be, and I act according to that. That is, man is violent, that violence is shown in competition, in the so-called discipline, which is suppression, that violence, ambition, competition, a brutal expression of aggressiveness, which are all the responses of the animal. And from that we act. And so there is always conflict in action. That is, action must conform to a pattern - right and wrong according to principles, beliefs, tradition, environmental influence, the culture in which I have been brought up. So action as far as we see, as far as our life is, is according to a particular image, a particular pattern, a particular formula. And that formula, that image, that idea has not solved a thing in the world. It has not solved our human deep innate problems. And if we keep on insisting that's the only way to act, how can you act without thinking, without having an idea, without following day after day a certain routine - so we accept that as the way of life, which is conflict, conflict which is the result of our action, of our life, of our relationship, of our ideas, of our thought. I mean you cannot dispute this fact, that having an idea, a principle, a belief, that you are a Hindu, god knows what else, and according to that tradition, according to that framework you live and act. And when you do that there is bound to be conflict - the idea, the 'what should be' is different from the fact, 'what is'. Right,

that's simple. And that's the way we have lived for millennia.

Now is there another way? A way of life which is action, which is relationship, but without conflict, which means without idea. Please listen to this carefully. First see the problem. It's a challenge. And you don't know any other way to respond to that problem except the old way. That is, conformity, imitativeness, the repetition, establishing a habit, and from that repetitive, imitative, habitual way of life we act, the habitual way of life is what we call action. And that has brought about untold misery, chaos in the human mind and heart. Look, very simply put: you have a pleasure, and you want the repetition of that pleasure, sexual or any other form of pleasure, and you keep on living with that pleasure, either in memory or in thought. And that pleasure, that thought of that pleasure, pushes you to an action, and in that action there is conflict, there is pain, there is misery. The habit has established and from that habit you act.

So is there another totally different way of living, which is acting? That means you have listened very carefully attentively to the way you have lived and you know all the implications of it, not just patches of it. To listen totally implies that you hear the whole problem, not just one or two sketches of that problem. When you listen to those crows, listen in the sense that your mind is quiet, attentive, not interpreting, not condemning, not resisting, you are listening totally, you are listening to the total sound, not of a crow, to the total sound; and in the same way if you can listen to this total problem of action, with which you are very familiar, if you can listen totally to that problem, to the problem, to the issue, to the way you live, from idea, action, totally listen, then you have the

energy to listen to something else. But if you have not listened totally to the present way of action then you have not the energy to follow what is going to come. After all, to find out anything you must have energy, and you need a great deal of energy to enquire into something totally new. And to have that energy you must have listened to the old pattern of life, neither condemning nor approving, listen to it totally, which means you have understood it. You have understood the futility of living. When you have listened to the futility of it you are already out of it. When you have not intellectually but deeply felt the uselessness of living that way, and have listened to it completely, totally, then you have the energy to enquire. If you have not the energy you cannot enquire. That is, by denying that which has brought about this misery, this conflict, which we have gone into a little bit, by denying it, the very negation of it is the positive action. I am going to go into that a little bit.

We said is there any other action in which there is no conflict, which is not a repetitive activity, a repetitive form of pleasure. To find that out we must go into this question of what is love. Don't get sentimental, emotional, or devotional, but we are going to enquire. Love is always negative, it must be. Love is not thought. Love is never contradictory - thought is. Thought which is the response of memory, these are all the animal instincts and so on and so on, the machinery of thinking, that is always contradictory, and when there is an action born of thought, that action which is contradictory brings conflict and misery. And in enquiring, in examining if there is any other activity which is not wrought with pain, with anxiety, with conflict, you must find out, or rather you

must be in a state of negation. You understand? To enquire, to examine you must be in a state of negation, otherwise you can't examine. You must be in a state of not knowing, otherwise how can you examine. The way of life to which we are accustomed to is what is called a positive way, because there you see results, you can do it day after day, repetitively, based on imitation, habit, following, obeying, being drilled by society, or by yourself - that's all a positive activity in which there is conflict and misery. Please listen to all this. And when you deny that, the very process of denial, the very process of your turning back on it is a state of negation because you don't know what comes next. It's not complicated, intellectually it will sound complicated, but it is not. When you turn your back on something you are finished with it.

Now, we said, love is total negation. We don't know what it means, we don't know what love means. We know what pleasure is, we mistake it for love. Where there is love there is no pleasure. Pleasure is the result of thought. Obviously. I look at something beautiful, thought comes in and begins to think about it, creates images. Watch it in yourself. And that image gives you a great deal of pleasure, or that scene, or that feeling. And thought gives to that pleasure sustenance, continuity, and in family life that is what you call love - which has nothing whatever to do with love, you are only concerned with pleasure. And therefore where there is a pursuit of pleasure there is imitative continuity in time. Whereas love has no continuity. Because love is not pleasure, and to understand what love is, to be in that state, there must be negation of the positive. When you say you love somebody, your wife, or your husband, your children, what is involved in it? Strip it of all

words, of all sentiment, emotionalism, and look at it factually, what is involved in it when you say, 'I love my wife' or my husband? Essentially it is pleasure and security. We are not being cynical, these are facts. And if you really loved your wife and your children, loved, not the pleasure it gives you belonging to a family, a narrow little group, sexually and furthering your own particular egotism, if you really loved your family you would have a different kind of education. You are only concerned with technological studies, helping your son to pass some stupid little exam and getting a job. You would educate him to understand the whole process of living, not just one part, segment, a fragment of this vast life. If you really loved your son there would be no wars, you would see to it. That means you would have no nationality, no separative religions. All that nonsense would go.

So thought cannot under any circumstances bring about a state of love. And thought can only understand what is positive, not what is negative. That is, how can you through thought find out what love is? You can't, can you? You can't calculate love, you can't say, 'I'll practise day after day being generous, kind, tender, gentle, thinking about others' - that will not create love. That's still a positive action by thought. So it's only when there is the absence of thinking you can understand what it is to be negative, not through thought. Thought can only create the pattern, and according to that pattern, formula, act; and hence conflict. And if you would find out a way of living in which there is no conflict at all, at any time, you must understand this love which is total negation.

That is, sirs, how can you love, how can there be love when

there is self-centred activity, either of righteousness, or smug respectability, or of ambition, greed, envy, competition, which are all positive processes of thought. How can you love? You can't, it is impossible. You can pretend, you can use the word, love, be very emotional, sentimental, very loyal, but that is nothing whatsoever to do with love. And to understand what it is you have to understand this positive thing called thinking.

So out of this negation which is called love there is action, which is the most positive, because it does not create conflict. Because after all that's what we want in this world, to live in a world where there is no conflict, where there is actually peace, both outward and inward, because you must have peace otherwise you are destroyed, because it is only in peace that any goodness can flower. It's only in peace that you see beauty. If your mind is tortured, anxious, envious, a battlefield, how can you see what is beautiful? Surely beauty is not thought, the thing that creates it, is created by thought, it is not beauty.

So to find out an action which is not based on idea, concept and formula, you must listen to the whole of that structure, see, understand that whole structure completely, and in the very understanding of it you have turned away from it. And therefore your mind then is in a state of negation, not bitterness, not cynicism, but because it sees the futility of living that way, actually sees it, and therefore ends it. When you end something there is a beginning of the new. But we are afraid to end the old because the new we want to translate in terms of the old. You will say, 'If I realize that I don't really love my family, which means I am not responsible for it, and then I am at liberty to chase another woman,

or another man' - which is again the process of thinking.

So thought is not the way out. You can be very clever, erudite, but if you want to find a way of action that is totally different, that will give a bliss to life, you must understand the whole machinery of thinking, and in the very understanding of what is positive, which is thought, you enter into a different dimension of action, which is essentially love. That means to enquire you must be free, otherwise you can't enquire, you can't examine, and this chaos in the world and mess demands re-examination totally, not according to your terms, not according to your fancies, pleasures, idiosyncrasies, or the activities to which you have been committed. You have to think of the whole thing anew, and the new can only be born in negation, not out of the positive assertion of what has been. And the new can only come into being when there is that total emptiness which is real love. Then you will find out for yourself what action is, in which there is no conflict at any time. And that is the rejuvenation that the mind needs, because it is only when the mind has been made young, through love, not through sentiment, not through devotion, not through following, it's only through love, which is total negation of life of the positive, thought. Then only such a mind can build a new world, a new relationship, and it's only such a mind that can go beyond the limitations and enter into a totally different dimension. And that dimension is something which no word, no thought, no experience, can ever discover, it's only when you totally deny the past, which is thought, totally deny it every day of your life, therefore there is never a moment of accumulation. It's only then you will find out for yourself a dimension which is bliss, which is not of time, which

is something that lies beyond the human thought.

UNCONDITIONING AND SIMPLICITY, MARCH, 1966

I think it is necessary to consider what is actually taking place in the world, not only in this country but in different parts of the world there are grave incidents, deep questions are being asked, and I think we should from the beginning consider most objectively what is actually taking place. There is general deterioration, of that there is no question. Morally, religiously, the old values have completely gone. There is great disturbance and discontent in every part of the world. They are questioning the purpose of education, purpose of man's existence altogether, not only in a very limited manner as it is being done in this country, but also extensively, deeply. And one can see both in the west and in this country that this questioning, this challenge, is not being adequately met. In this country you know as well as I do, probably better because I am an alien resident, I come occasionally, every year for three or four months, and I observe the rapid decline, where people are willing to burn themselves over such trivial questions about whether you should have two governors or one governor. And you are willing to fast over some idiotic little question. The holy men are ready to attack people, and so on and on and on. A tribal approach to a tremendous problem. And I don't think we are aware of this immense problem. This country has dissipated its energy in various trivial things, responding to the pressure of circumstances, without having a large, wide outlook. It has approached nationalistically every problem, including the problem of starvation. There is no consideration of man as a whole,

only consideration of the limitation of a particular tribe, a particular narrow, religious, sectarian outlook.

We all know this, and apparently the government, the people are incapable of stopping all this. They are caught in utter inefficiency, deep distrust, wide discontent, unable to respond totally, deeply to the whole issue. And you will see in Europe, and in America, as well as in Russia and China, there is tremendous discontent. And again that discontent is being answered very narrowly. There is a war, and people treat wars as a favourite war and not a favourite war, a war that is righteous, a war that is not politically right. You take sides when you have preached for forty years and more, non-violence, you are ready to battle, to kill, to become violent at the throw of a hat. You see all this.

And when you consider all this, not only what is taking place in the west and in India, the problem is so great and I do not think any of the politicians, any of the religious leaders throughout the world, see the problem as a whole, they see it according to their limited political, religious point of view; or according to their particular economic demand, or social demand. No one apparently states the whole problem, entirely as a whole, and deals with it as a total thing, not fragmentarily, not as a Sikh, not as a Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Catholic, Communist, Socialist. And because we are not dealing with the problem as a whole people are trying to escape in different ways: they are taking LSD, the drug that gives them tremendous experience. They are going off at tangents, responding to minor, infantile, immature challenges, and responding equally immaturely.

So we, if you are at all concerned with the problem, and

everyone of us must be: there is starvation, there is war, religion has totally failed, it has no more meaning, any more, except some old ladies, and slightly demented people. Organized belief is losing its power, though propaganda in the name of religion, in the name of god, in the name of peace is everlastingly being trumpeted in newspapers and everywhere. So education, religion, politics, have completely failed to answer the problem, and science hasn't answered it either. And it's no good looking to those things any more, nor to any leader, or to any teacher, because man has lost faith in all this, and because he has lost faith he is afraid and therefore he is violent, not only in this country, all the world over people are violent - the riots that are going on in America between the white and the black, the appalling things that are taking place in this country. Essentially man has lost faith, not only in those beliefs, in those ideals, in the values which have been set up for him, but also in himself he has completely lost faith, he doesn't know where to turn, in what direction to look for any light. And because he has lost faith he is afraid. And because he is afraid the only answer to fear is violence. This is what is taking place.

So we have, if we are at all serious, and for god's sake we have to be serious, dreadfully earnest, not according to some belief, according to some pattern, but serious to find out so that we can begin again to discover the source which has dried up. I do not know if you have observed that in yourself, as a human being, not as a fragmentary being in a world of fragments, as a human being whether an Indian, a Hindu, a Muslim, a Sikh, a Christian, a communist, a socialist, and so on, as a human being, and therefore no nationality, and therefore doesn't belong to any religion, nor to

any political party or ideology, just as a human being, if you have observed yourself as a human being you will see in yourself, and therefore you will see in others, that the source of our being, of our existence, the meaning of our life, the struggle that we are making all day long, has no meaning any more. And therefore we have to find for ourselves that source which has dried up, and if it is possible to find the waters of that immense reality again. And from that reality act. And that's what we are going to discover for ourselves during all these talks here.

You understand the problem, sirs? Religions, leaders, whether political or religious, the books, the propaganda, the beliefs, the doctrines, the saviours, all have lost their meaning to any really serious intellectual man totally aware of all these problems. All those upon which we have relied have lost totally their meaning. You are no longer religious people, that you pretend to be. You are no longer a human being because we have lost the purpose, the meaning, the significance of our existence. You can go to the office for the next forty years, as a routine, earn a livelihood, but that is no answer either. So to discover this whole thing, to understand this whole immense problem, we have to look at it anew, not with eyes of a Christian, a Hindu, a Muslim, or a communist, we have to look at it totally anew. Which means first we mustn't be driven by circumstances, not respond to the immediate problems. We have to act on the immediate problems, but not act as though that was the only thing in life.

So we must be aware of the circumstances, and not be compelled by them to act. Do you understand the issue? Because in this country you are quarrelling over little pieces of land, and ready

to burn and kill each other, because you happen to be a Sikh, a Muslim, or a Hindu, god knows what else. And compulsion of the environment, circumstance is so strong that you react. Therefore one has to be aware of the circumstances, what is implied in those circumstances, act as little as possible depending on those circumstances. Then one has to be aware of one's temperament, and not be guided by one's temperament, or act according to one's inclination. These three things are essentially important when you are facing an immense problem: not be guided by our inclination, however pleasurable, however demanding, not to act according to your personal inclination. That's the first thing to realize.

Then, not your activity, your life shaped by your temperament, whether you are intellectual, emotional, or various form of idiosyncrasies, not to be shaped by them, nor compelled by circumstances. If we can understand these things fully, these three things then we shall be able to meet this immense challenge, these immense problems. Which is the human being is at stake. You understand? It's so infantile to consider whether some land, governor - all that's too immature, too childish, too appalling.

So what we have to do if you are at all serious, and it is absolutely necessary to be serious, because the house is burning, not only the house that's called India, but the world is burning, and you must be able to respond to it totally, not bring a little bucket of sand, hope to put the fire out. So you have to be so enormously serious. And I am afraid we have not been serious. We have dissipated our energies because we have responded to circumstances which are so trivial and wasted our energies in all these directions: you became followers of Gandhiji, you became

followers of something else and on and on and on. So having dissipated your energy when the immense problem is put before you, you are incapable of responding to it totally. Therefore one has to begin, if one would understand this immense problem of man, and man is at stake, human being is at stake, not any particular individual, the whole human being is at a stake, and to understand that immense problem you have first not to be guided by your inclination, not according to your pleasure or dislike. You have to look at the problem, and you cannot look at the problem if you are depending on your personal inclination, or be guided by your temperament. You know most of us are very clever people, because we have read a great deal, we have passed many exams, our mind, our intellect is very cunning, deceptive, hypocritical. And our temperament is this capacity to deceive itself, to assert itself, to function along a particular demands. And of course when you are driven by circumstances, compelled to act according to circumstances you cannot possibly be concerned with the total human being.

So those are the first things one has to be aware of: inclination, temperament, and circumstances. When you have understood those then you can face the immense problem of man. Your personal inclination is whether you believe in a god, or don't believe in a god. Those are all personal prejudices that have no value at all. When you approach a problem intellectually, or emotionally, or sentimentally, that's your particular temperament. One can go much more deeply into this question of your temperament, but that is not important now.

So any particular approach to this immense problem indicates

either you are being guided by your inclinations, or compelled by circumstances, or you are acting according to your narrow little temperament.

So if that is very clear, that we cannot possibly act according to these, therefore we will then be able to look at the problem entirely differently. And there is an immense problem because man, that's a human being, has lost, if he ever had, has lost the source, the fountain, the depth, the vitality of living anew; he has become a lonely human being, frightened, anxious, caught in despair, discontent, unhappy, tremendous sorrow. You may not be aware of all this because nobody wants to look at oneself very clearly. To look at oneself clearly is very difficult because we want to escape from ourselves, and when we do look at ourselves we don't know what to do with ourselves. And so our problem is, as the source of our human being, as the source of our existence is drying up, has lost its meaning, we have now to find out for ourselves what it all means. In the west they have passed brilliant examinations, young men, they see war, they see great business corporations, executives and so on, and they say, what is the point of it all - what is the point of war, what is the point of becoming very clever, having a lot of money, when life itself has no more any meaning. So they take various forms of drugs - that gives them a tremendous sense of new experience, and they are satisfied with that. These are not the stupid people who take these things, they are very intelligent, very sensitive, highly trained people, because life has no longer any meaning. You can invent a meaning, you can invent a purpose, you can invent a significance, but these inventions are purely the acts of an intellectual mind, and therefore have no validity. Nor has faith

any validity any more. Whether you believe, or don't believe, has no meaning at all, because you will believe according to your circumstances; if you are born in this country you will be a Hindu, or a Sikh, or a Muslim, or god knows what, according to circumstances you are forced to believe, or as a communist, and so on and on and on. So belief, an invented purpose of life, a significance carefully put together by the intellect have no meaning any more. I don't think you see the seriousness of this: man has come to the end of his inventions, his beliefs, his dogmas, his gods, his hopes, his fears, he has come to an absolute precipice, to the end. You may not be aware of this, you may still be hiding behind the walls of your beliefs, or your hopes, but they are illusions, they have no validity at all when you are faced with this crisis.

So having realized this, if you are at all capable of realizing it, then one must proceed to begin to find out how to renew the mind, to renew the total being. You understand? I hope I am making my question clear. Look sirs: human beings for over five thousand years and more have struggled, has had to face his own immense sorrow, has to face death, wars, disillusionment, the utter hopelessness of life without any meaning. And always inventing his gods, always inventing a heaven and a hell to keep himself righteous, always surrounding himself with ideas, ideals, hopes, but all that has gone. Your Ramas and Sitas, your Upanishads, your great gods, everything has gone in smoke, and you are faced with yourself as a human being, and you have to answer. Therefore your responsibility as a human being becomes extraordinarily great.

So our question then is: how is a mind that has been so heavily conditioned for so many centuries, through so many agonies, how

is such a mind to be made new so that it can function totally differently, think entirely differently? You understand the question? So the communists and the totalitarians say, we will shape the mind. You understand? We will break the mind and recondition it. You are following all this? The Catholics, the Protestants, the Hindus have done this, the Muslims, all the people all over the world have done this, over and over again, and so each human being is so heavily conditioned, conditioned in one way and reconditioned in another, by the politicians, by propaganda, by the priests, by commissars, by socialists, you know, endlessly reshaped, and again reshaped. And when you realize that, that absolute fact, this absolute truth, not according to me or according to you, but that is the fact, when you realize that then you ask yourself whether it is at all possible to break this conditioning and not enter into another conditioning, but be free so that the mind can be a new thing, sensitive, alive, aware, intense, capable.

So that is our problem. There is no other problem. Because when the mind is made new then it can tackle any problem, whether it is a scientific problem, or the problem of starvation, corruption. Then it is capable of dealing with it in any circumstances.

So that is our main issue: a mind that has been so heavily conditioned for so many centuries, whether it is possible to uncondition itself and not fall into another conditioning; and therefore be free, capable, intensely alive, anew, fresh so that it can meet any problem. As I said, that's the only question we have to face, and as human beings we have to find the answer. And you cannot depend on anybody to tell you what to do. You understand?

You cannot depend on anybody to tell you how to uncondition yourself; and if you do depend on that person you are conditioning yourself according to his ideas, therefore you are back again, caught.

So see the immense problem that is in front of you. There is no leader, no saviour, no guru, no authority any more. Because all they have done is to condition you as a Hindu, Muslim, Christian, whatever you like, as a communist and all that. And they have not answered the problem. They have found no solution to human misery, to human anxiety, to human despair. They have given you escapes, and escapes are not the answer. When you have got cancer you can't run away from it, you have to face it. So that is the first thing to realize, that you cannot possibly rely on anybody to uncondition you. You know when you realize that either you get frightened, because you can't rely on anybody you are left to yourself and that is a very frightening thing; or you are no longer frightened and you see that you have to work, and nobody can help you, therefore you have vitality, you have energy, you have the drive then. And you can only have the drive, the energy, the vitality when you are no longer depending on anybody and no longer afraid. Then you are no longer following anybody. Then you are your own master, your own pupil, you are learning, you are discovering.

So our question being very clear, how do we proceed? You understand the question? You understand the problem? If the problem is very clear, and it must be clear, otherwise you can't answer it - the question can be put in different ways, but the essence of the problem is always the same: that human minds are

shaped by circumstances, by environmental influences, by one's own temperament and inclination, which shape the mind, which condition the mind, and a mind that is conditioned, a mind that is moulded by a particular belief, by a particular dogma, by a particular experience or tendency, such a mind cannot possibly answer this question. The question being, is it possible for the mind which has been made so dull, heavy, stupid by circumstances, by environment, and so on, so heavily conditioned, can that mind free itself and therefore meet every problem of life anew? I say that it can. And I am going to go into it, show you whether it is possible or not. But I am not your teacher, nor are you my followers - god forbid! Because the moment you follow something you have destroyed the truth. If you have a leader you are destroying the truth. So all that we can do is to consider together, take the journey together, not I lead you along a path, or show you, but together partake, share together this question, and discover together the issues and the way out.

So to share demands not merely stretching your hand out and receiving something, to share means that you must be capable of sharing, which means you must be extraordinarily alive, keen to find out, otherwise you can't share. Somebody can give you the most beautiful jewel, but if you don't know that is the most precious thing you will throw it away and you cannot share it. And to journey together, you must be capable of walking together. And the capacity to walk, to share, to observe, depends on your earnestness, and that earnestness, that seriousness comes into being when you see the immensity of the problem. It is the problem that makes you serious, not that you become serious. You understand

the difference? We say we are serious and tackle the problem. That's not it at all. The problem itself is so great, and that very greatness makes you serious, then that seriousness has vitality, that seriousness has pliability, and enormous strength and vitality to go to the very end of it.

So we are taking the journey together, therefore we are sharing the thing together, therefore you are no longer a listener, you no longer just hear a few words, a few ideas, which you either accept or reject - say, I like this, I don't like that. Because we have gone beyond all that, which is mere inclination.

So our first question is: is it possible for a human mind that has been so heavily conditioned to break through it? You cannot possibly break through it if you are not aware of your conditioning. That's an obvious fact, isn't it. You can't say, 'Well, I am conditioned, and I must break through it', that has no meaning. But if you are aware how you are conditioned, what are the factors of your conditioning, what are the circumstances, then being aware of these conditionings then you can do something. But if you are not aware of it then you can't do a thing. So first is to be aware of your conditioning - conditioning, how you think, how you feel, what are the motives behind that thinking, feeling. You may say, 'Well, this is all too complicated, I want a simple pill which I can take very quickly, and the whole problem solved' - there is no such pill. Life is a very complex process, and you cannot solve it by some kind of trick. You have to see the complexity of it, and you can only see the complexity of it if you are completely simple. You understand, sirs? If you are really simple, then you can see how extraordinarily complex you are, and all your conditioning. But to be simple is one

of the most difficult things.

Simplicity is not a loin cloth, or having one meal a day, or walking round the earth preaching some idiotic nonsense. Simplicity is not obedience. Please do listen to all this. Simplicity is not following an ideal. Simplicity is not imitation. Just to be simple so that you can look. You know you can only look at a tree, or a flower, or the beauty of an evening when your eyes are not clouded, when your mind is not somewhere else, when you are not tortured by your own particular little problem, then you can look at the tree, then the evening has beauty, then out of that simplicity you can observe. And as I said, to be simple is one of the most difficult and arduous things, simple. But you see that word has been loaded by all the saints, with all their pretensions, with their dogmas, therefore they are not simple people at all. A simple mind means a mind that can see very clearly, and the moment you see with clarity, anything, the problem is over. That's why to look at our conditioning needs clarity. And you can only have clarity when you don't say, 'I like', or 'I don't like'. You understand sir? I want to see myself as a human being, actually 'what is', not what I pretend and all that rubbish, but actually what is. To see very clearly there must be light, and there is no light if what I see I translate in terms of like or dislike. You understand? It is simple, sir, when you go into it, very, very simple.

That is, to see anything there must be light. And to have light there must be care. And with clarity and care you can observe. But that clarity and care is denied when you condemn what you see, or justify what you see. Therefore when you want to see very clearly, like and dislike, judgement, condemnation, disappears. Am I

making myself clear, because this is a very serious thing? Then you will find that you are your own guide, then you are your own light, which nobody can put out. And that way one begins to discover for oneself the source of all life. That source which has dried up, which man has been seeking everlastingly. You may have great prosperity, as they do in the west and in America, you may be hungry, miserable, but mere solutions of these is not the answer, because the human being is at stake. His house, which is himself, is burning, and to find the answer you must be able to look clearly, and therefore when you look clearly you can reason clearly. And reason becomes insanity when there is obscurity. You understand sir? The politicians, because they are obscure, therefore they are breeding inefficiency, hatred, division among man. And also the priests, whether in the west or in the east, are contributing to this darkness. Religion after all is not a matter of belief, not what you believe or what you don't believe. Religion is the way of life, it doesn't depend on any belief, or any dogma, on any rituals. Only the religious mind which lives peacefully can find that ultimate reality.

CONVERSATION WITH HUSTON SMITH 1968 CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Huston Smith: I am Huston Smith, professor of philosophy at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and I invite you to a conversation arranged by the Blaisdale Institute of Claremont, California, with Krishnamurti, who was raised by Annie Besant and the Theosophists to be a teacher, and who, though he discarded the mantle of Theosophy, did indeed become a sage of our century, one whose voice is heard as much by the youth of today as throughout the world for the last sixty years.

Krishnamurti, maybe this morning I will have only one question which in one way or another I will be coming back to in various ways. In your writings, in your speaking, time and again you come back to this wonderful little word, lucid and lucidity, but is it possible living as we are in this confused and confusing world, torn by conflicting voices without and conflicting tensions within, with hearts that seem star crossed and tensions that never go, is it possible in such a life, in such a world, to live with total lucidity? And if so, how?

Krishnamurti: I wonder, sir, what you mean by that word 'lucid'. I wonder whether you mean clarity.

HS: That's what first comes to mind, yes.

K: Is this clarity a matter of intellectual perception, or is it a perception with your whole being, not merely a fragment of your being, but with the totality of one's whole being?

HS: It certainly has the ring of the latter, it's the latter.

K: It is not fragmentary, therefore it is not intellectual or

emotional, or sentimental. And so is it possible in this confused world, with so many contradictions, and such misery and starvation, not only outwardly, but also inwardly, such insufficiency psychologically, outwardly there are so many rich societies, is it at all possible for a human being living in this world to find within himself a clarity that is constant, that is true in the sense not contradictory, is it a possible for a human being to find it?

HS: That's my question.

K: Your question. I don't see why not. I don't see why it shouldn't be found by anybody who is really quite serious. Most of us are not serious at all, we want to be entertained, we want to be told what to do, we want someone else to tell us how to live, what this clarity is, what is truth, what is god, what is righteous behaviour and so on. Now if we could discard completely all the authority of psychological specialists, as well as the specialists in religion, if one could really deeply negate all authority of that kind, then one would be relying totally on oneself.

HS: Well, I feel I may be right off, I am contradicting what you are suggesting because my impulse after you have said that it seems to you that it is possible to achieve this lucidity, my impulse is to ask you immediately, how.

K: Wait, sir.

HS: But you say, am I looking to authority.

K: No, no. What is necessary is the freedom from authority, not the 'how'. The 'how' implies a method, a system, a way trodden by others, and someone to tell you, do this and you will find it.

HS: Now, are you saying with this that it is an inappropriate

question to ask you how this lucidity is to be achieved?

K: No, not at all, sir. But the 'how' implies that, the 'how' implies a method, a system. And the moment you have a system and a method you become mechanical, you just do what you are told. And that's not clarity. It is like a child being told by its mother what it should be from morning until night. And therefore it becomes dependent on the mother, or the father, whatever it be, and there is no clarity. So to have clarity, the first essential thing is freedom. Freedom from authority.

HS: And I feel in a kind of bind, because this freedom is attractive too and I want to go towards that, but I also want to pick your mind and ask you how to proceed? Am I moving away from my freedom if I ask you how to proceed?

K: No, sir, but I am pointing out the difficulty of that word, the implication of that word, the 'how'. Not whether one is wandering away from freedom, or any other thing of that kind, but the word 'how' implies intrinsically a mind that says, please tell me what to do.

HS: Yes. And I ask again, is that a mistaken question, is that a wrong question?

K: I should think that's a wrong question, the 'how'. But rather if you say, what are the things, the obstructions that prevent clarity, then we can go into it. But if you say right from the beginning, what is the method - there have been a dozen methods and they have all failed, they have not produced clarity, or enlightenment, or a state of peace in man. On the contrary these methods have divided man; you have your method, and somebody else has his method, and these methods are everlastingly quarrelling with each

other.

HS: Are you saying that once you abstract certain principles and formulate them into a method, this becomes too crude to meet the intricacies.

K: That's right. The intricacies, and the complexities and the living quality of clarity.

HS: So that the 'how' must always be immediate, from where one stands, the particular individual.

K: I would never put the 'how' at all. The 'how' should never enter into the mind.

HS: Well, this is a hard teaching. It may be true and I am reaching for it, and yet I don't know that it's possible - I don't feel that it's possible completely to relinquish the question how and everything.

K: Sir, I think we shall be able to understand each other if we could go a little slowly, not into the 'how', but what are the things that prevent clarity.

HS: All right, fine.

K: Through negation, through negation come to clarity, not through the positive method of following a system.

HS: Fine. All right. The negative approach, that is good.

K: I think that is the only way. The positive way of the 'how' has lead man to divide himself, his loyalties, his pursuits, you have the 'how' of yours, and the 'how' of somebody else, and the method of this and they are all lost.

HS: Fine.

K: So if we could put aside that question, 'the how' for the time being, probably you will never put it, afterwards. I hope you won't.

HS: Well, we'll see.

K: So what is important is to find out what are the obstructions, the hindrances, the blocks that prevent clear perception of human anxiety, fear, sorrow, and the ache of loneliness, the utter lack of love and all that.

HS: Let's explore the virtues of the negative. What are these?

K: Now, first of all I feel, there must be freedom. Freedom from authority.

HS: Could we stop right there on this matter of authority. When you say we should renounce all authority, it seems to me that the goal of total freedom and self reliance is a valid one, and yet along the way it seems to me that we rely, and should rely, on all kinds of authorities in certain spheres. When I go to a new territory and I stop to ask the filling station attendant which way to go, I accept his authority as he knows more about that than I do. Isn't this...

K: Obviously, sir, the specialist knows a little more than the layman, the experts whether in surgery or technological knowledge, obviously they know much more than any other person who is not concerned with that particular technique. But we are considering not authority along any particular line, but the whole problem of authority.

HS: And in that area is the answer to understand the areas in which there is specialized authority, which we should accept, and where...

K: And where authority is detrimental.

HS: Yes.

K: Authority is destructive. So there are two problems involved in this question of authority: there is not only the authority of the

expert - let's call him for the moment - which is necessary, but also the authority of the man who says, psychologically I know, you don't.

HS: I see.

K: This is true, this is false, you must do this, and you must not do that.

HS: So one should never turn over one's life to...

K: To anybody.

HS:... to anyone else.

K: Because the churches throughout the world, the different religions, have said, give your life to us, we will direct, we'll shape it, we will tell you what to do. Do this, follow the saviour, follow the church and you will have peace. But, on the contrary churches have produced terrible wars. Religions of every kind have brought about fragmentation of the mind. So the question is not, freedom from a particular authority, but the whole conceptual acceptance of authority.

HS: Yes. All right. I think I see that and one should never abdicate one's own conscience.

K: No, I am not talking of conscience. Our conscience is such a petty little affair.

HS: Well may be we are thinking about conscience - I am thinking about the conscience of how I should live my life, how I should live.

K: No, we started out to say, asking the question, why is it man who has lived for two million years and more, why is man not capable of clear perception and action? That is the question involved.

HS: Right. And your first point is that it is because he doesn't accept the full responsibility...

K: I don't say that. No, I haven't come to that point yet. I am saying that, as we said, we must approach this problem negatively. Which means I must find out what are the blockages.

HS: Obstacles.

K: Obstacles which prevent perception.

HS: Right.

K: Now one of the major blocks, or hindrances, is this total acceptance of authority.

HS: All right. So be ye lamps unto yourself.

K: That's right. So you must be a light to yourself.

HS: Very good.

K: To be a light to yourself you must deny every other light, however great that light be, whether it be the light of the Buddha, or X Y Z.

HS: Perhaps, accept it here or there but nevertheless you retain the say-so as to where you find it might be valid.

K: No, no sir. No, no. My own authority. What authority have I? My authority is the authority of the society. I am conditioned to accept authority, when I reject the authority of the outer I accept the authority of the inner. And my authority of the inner is the result of the conditioning in which I have been brought up.

HS: All right. I thought I had this in place. And I guess perhaps I still do. The only point that I am not quite sure about at this point is, it seems to me while assuming, accepting, affirming and maintaining one's own freedom...

K: Ah, you can't. Sir, how can a prisoner, except ideologically,

or theoretically, accept he is free? He is in prison, and that is the fact from which we must move.

HS: I see.

K: Not accept, obey, fantastic ideological freedom which doesn't exist. What exists is that man has bowed to this total authority.

HS: All right. And this is the first thing we must see and remove.

K: Absolutely. Completely that must go, for a man that is serious, and wants to find out the truth, or see things very clearly. That is one of the major points. And the demand of freedom, not only from authority, but the demand from fear, which makes him accept authority.

HS: Right. That seems true also. And so beneath the craving for authority is...

K:... is fear.

HS:... is fear which we look to authority to be free from.

K: That's right. So the fear makes man violent, not only territorial violence, but sexual violence and different forms of violence.

HS: All right.

K: So the freedom from authority implies the freedom from fear. And the freedom from fear implies the cessation of every form of violence.

HS: If we stop violence then our fear recedes?

K: Ah, no sir. It's not a question of recession of fear. Let's put it round the other way, sir. Man is violent, linguistically, psychologically, in daily life he is violent, which ultimately leads

to war.

HS: There's a lot of it around.

K: And man has accepted war as the way of life, whether in the office, or at home, or in the playing field, or anywhere war he has accepted as a way of life, which is the very essence of violence.

HS: Yes.

K: And aggression and all that is involved. So as long as man accepts violence, lives a way of life which is violent, he perpetuates fear and therefore violence and also accepts authority.

HS: So these three are a kind of vicious circle, each playing into the other.

K: And the churches say, live peacefully, be kind, love your neighbour, which is all sheer nonsense. They don't mean it. It is merely a verbal assertion that has no meaning at all. It is just an idea because the morality of society which is the morality of the church is immoral.

HS: Are we trying to see then these things that stand between us and lucidity and freedom, we find authority and fear and violence working together to obstruct us, where do we go from there?

K: It's not going to some place, sir, but understanding this fact that most of us live a life in this ambience, in this cage of authority, fear and violence. We can't go beyond it, unless one is free from it, not intellectually or theoretically, but actually be free from every form of authority, not the authority of the expert, but the feeling of dependence on authority.

HS: All right.

K: Then, is it possible for a human being to be free completely of fear? Not only at the superficial level of one's consciousness, but

also at the deeper level, what is called the unconscious.

HS: Is it possible?

K: That's the question, otherwise you are bound to accept authority of anybody, any Tom, Dick and Harry, with a little bit of knowledge, little bit of cunning explanation or intellectual formulas, you are bound to fall for it. But the question whether a human being, so heavily conditioned as he is, through propaganda of the church, through propaganda of society, morality and all the rest of it, whether such a human being can really be free from fear. That is the basic question, sir.

HS: That's what I wait to hear.

K: I say it is possible, not in abstraction, but actually it is possible.

HS: All right. And my impulse again is to say, how.

K: Refrain. You see when you say, how, you stop learning. You cease to learn.

HS: All right, let's just forget that I said that.

K: No, no, you can never even ask that, ever, because we are learning; learning about the nature and the structure of human fear. At the deepest level and also at the most superficial level, and we are learning about it. And when you are learning you can't ask suddenly, how am I to learn. There is no 'how' if you are interested, if the problem is vital, intense, it has to be solved to live peacefully, then there is no 'how', you say, let's learn about it.

HS: All right.

K: So the moment you bring in the 'how' you move away from the central fact of learning.

HS: All right, that's fine. Let's continue on the path of learning

about this.

K: Learning. So, what does it mean to learn?

HS: Are you asking me?

K: Yes. Obviously. What does it mean to learn?

HS: It means to perceive how one should proceed in a given domain.

K: No, sir, surely. Here is a problem of fear. I want to learn about it. First of all I mustn't condemn it, I mustn't say, it's terrible, and run away from it.

HS: It sounds to me that you have been condemning it in one way or another.

K: I don't, I don't, I want to learn. When I want to learn about something I look, there is no condemnation at all.

HS: Well, we were going at this through a negative route.

K: Which is what I am doing.

HS: And fear is an obstacle.

K: About which I am going to learn.

HS: All right.

K: Therefore I can't condemn it.

HS: Well it's not good, you are not advocating it.

K: Ah, no. I am neither advocating or not. Here is a fact of fear. I want to learn about it. The moment I learn about something I am free of it. So learning matters. What is implied in learning? What is implied in learning? First of all to learn about something there must be complete cessation of condemnation, or justification.

HS: All right. Yes, I can see that. If we are going to understand something if we keep our emotions out of it, and try to dispassionately to...

K: To learn. You are introducing words like dispassion, that's unnecessary. If I want to learn about that camera, I begin to look at it, undo it, go into it. There is no question of dispassion or passion. I want to learn. So I want to learn about this question of fear. So to learn there must be no condemnation, no justification of fear, and therefore no escape verbally from the fact of fear.

HS: All right.

K: But the tendency is to deny it.

HS: To deny the reality.

K: The reality of fear. The reality that fear is causing all these things. To deny by saying, I must develop courage. So, please, we are going into this problem of fear because it is really a very important question: whether human mind can ever be free of fear.

HS: It certainly is.

K: Which means, whether the mind is capable of looking at fear, looking, not in abstraction, but actually at fear as it occurs.

HS: Facing fear.

K: Facing fear.

HS: All right, we should do this, and I agree with you that we can't deny it.

K: To face it, no condemnation.

HS: All right.

K: No justification.

HS: Simply being true, objective.

K: Aware of fear.

HS: Acknowledging.

K: I don't acknowledge it. If there is the camera there I don't acknowledge it, it is there.

HS: All right. I don't want to distract our line of thought with these words.

K: Please, sir, that's why one has to be awfully careful of words here, because the word is not the thing, therefore I don't want to move away from this. To learn about fear there must be no condemnation or justification. That's a fact. Then my mind can - the mind can look at fear. What is fear? There is every kind of fear: fear of darkness, fear of the wife, fear of the husband, fear of war, fear of storm, so many psychological fears. And you cannot possibly have the time to analyze all the fears, that would take the whole life time, by then you have not understood any fears.

HS: So it is the phenomenon of fear itself rather than any...

K: Than any particular fear.

HS: Right. Now what should we learn?

K: Wait, I am going to show you, sir, go slow. Now to learn about something you must be in complete contact with it. I want - look sir, I want to learn about fear. Therefore I must look at it, I must face it. Now to face something implies a mind that does not want to solve the problem of fear.

HS: To look at fear...

K: Is not to solve the problem of fear.

HS: Now...

K: Look, look, this is very important to understand because if I want to solve fear I am more concerned with the solution of fear than facing fear.

HS: A moment ago though we were saying we should think...

K: I am facing it. But if I say, I must solve it, I am beyond it already, I am not looking.

HS: You say that if we are trying to solve the problem of fear we are not truly facing it. Is that right?

K: Quite right, sir. You see, to face fear the mind must give its complete attention to fear, and if you give partial attention which is to say, I want to solve it and go beyond it, you are not giving it attention.

HS: I can see that if you have slipped attention while you are not fully attentive.

K: So, in giving complete attention to the learning about fear there are several problems involved in it. I must be brief because our time is limited. We generally consider fear as something outside us. So there is this question of the observer and the observed. The observer says, I am afraid, and he puts fear as something away from him.

HS: I am not sure. When I feel afraid, I am afraid, I feel it very much in here.

K: In here, but when you observe it, it is different.

HS: When I observe fear...

K: Then I put it outside.

HS: No, again that doesn't seem quite right.

K: All right, at the moment of fear there is neither the observer nor the observed.

HS: That is very true.

K: That is all I am saying. At the crisis, at the moment of actual fear there is no observer.

HS: It fills the horizon.

K: Now, the moment you begin to look at it, face it, there is this division.

HS: Between the fearful self and the...

K: The non-fearful self.

HS: The bear who is going to eat me out there.

K: So in trying to learn about fear, there is this division between the observer and the observed. Now is it possible to look at fear without the observer? Please, sir, this is really quite an intricate question, a complex question, one has to go into it very deeply. As long as there is the observer who is going to learn about the fear there is a division.

HS: That's true. We are not in full contact with it.

K: Therefore in that division is the conflict of trying to get rid of fear, justify fear. So is it possible to look at fear without the observer? So that you are completely in contact with it all the time.

HS: Well, then you are experiencing fear.

K: I wouldn't like to use that word 'experience', because experience implies going through something.

HS: All right. I don't know what word. It seems better than, looking at, because looking at does seem to imply a division between an observer and the observed.

K: Therefore we are using that word 'observing'. Being aware of fear without choice, which means the choice implies the observer, choosing whether I don't like this, or that. Therefore when the observer is absent there is choiceless awareness of fear.

HS: All right.

K: Right. Then what takes place? That's the whole question. The observer creates the linguistic difference between himself and the thing observed. Language comes in there. Therefore the word prevents being completely in contact with fear.

HS: Yes. Words can be a screen.

K: Yes. That's all that we are saying.

HS: All right.

K: So the word mustn't interfere.

HS: True. We have to go beyond that.

K: Beyond the word. But is that possible, to be beyond the word? Theoretically we say, yes, but we are a slave to words.

HS: Far too much so.

K: It is obvious, we are a slave to words.

HS: Right.

K: So the mind has to become aware of its own slavery to words, realizing that the word is never the thing.

HS: Right.

K: So the mind is free of the word to look. That is all implied. Sir, look, I want to understand - I mean, the relationship between two people, husband and wife, is the relationship of images.

HS: Obviously.

K: Obviously. There is no dispute about that. You have your image, and she has her image about you. The relationship is between these two images. Now, the real relationship is, the human relationship is when the images don't exist. In the same way the relationship between the observer and the observed ceases when the word is not.

HS: Yes.

K: So he is directly in contact with fear.

HS: We pass through.

K: Through. There is fear. Now there is fear at the conscious level, which one can understand fairly quickly. But there are the

deeper layers of fear, so-called at the hidden parts of the mind. To be aware of that. Now that means is it possible to be aware without analysis? Analysis takes time.

HS: Right. Surely it's possible.

K: How? Not the 'how' of method. You say, surely it is possible. Is it? There is this whole reservoir of fear - the fear of the rays, you follow, the whole content of the unconscious. The content is the unconscious.

HS: All right.

K: Now, to be aware of all that, which means not through dreams, again that takes too long.

HS: Are you talking about whether we can be explicitly aware of the full reach of mind?

K: Yes. The full content, reach of the mind which is both the conscious as well as the deeper layers. The totality of consciousness.

HS: Yes. And can we be explicitly aware of all of that? I am not sure.

K: I say it is possible. It is only possible when you are aware during the day what you say, the words you use, the gestures, the way you talk, the way you walk, what your thoughts are, to be completely and totally aware of all that.

HS: Do you think all of that can be before you in total awareness?

K: Yes, sir. Absolutely. When there is no condemnation and justification. When you are directly in contact with it.

HS: It seems to me that the mind is sort of like an iceberg with region of it...

K: An iceberg is one-tenth below and nine-tenths above. It is possible to see the whole of it, during the day. During the day if you are aware of your thoughts, of your feelings, aware of the motives, which demands a mind that is highly sensitive.

HS: We can certainly be aware of much, much more than we usually are. When you say we can be aware...

K: Totally, yes sir.

HS:... of all the psychological factors.

K: I am showing you. I am showing you. You are denying it. You say, it is not possible, then it is not possible.

HS: No, I'd like to believe that.

K: No, it's not a question of belief. I don't have to believe in what I see. It's only when I don't see I believe in god, or in this or that.

HS: For me it is a matter of belief, maybe not for you because you...

K: Belief is the most destructive part of life. Why should I believe the sun rises? I see the sun rises. I believe, when I do not know what love is then I believe in love.

HS: Like so many times when I listen to you speak it seems to me like a half truth which is stated as a full truth, and I wonder whether that is for the sake of emphasis, or whether it really is, you really mean to carry it all the way.

K: No, sir. To me it really is.

HS: We have been speaking of the elements that block us, the things that block us from a life of lucidity and freedom, authority, violence, fear. Our time is short and I wouldn't like to spend all the time on these obstacles. Is there any affirmative we can say of this

condition.

K: Sir, anything affirmative indicates authority. It's only the authoritarian mind that says, 'let's be affirmed'. Which is in opposition to negation. But the negation we are talking about has no opposite.

HS: Well now when I ask you for an affirmative statement it doesn't seem to me that I am turning over a decision to use an authority. I just want to hear if you have something interesting to say which I will then stand judgement upon.

K: With regard to what?

HS: As to whether it speaks to my condition.

K: What? With regard to what, you said something, about what?

HS: About the state of life that it seems to me we are groping for in our words to describe.

K: Are you trying to say, sir, that life is only in the present?

HS: In one sense I think that is true.

K: No, I am asking you, is this what you are asking: is life to be divided into the past, present and future, which becomes fragmentary, and not a total perception of living?

HS: Well again as so often it seems to me that the answer is both, and. In one sense it is a unity and it is present and the present is all we have, but man is a time-binding animal, as they say, who looks before and aft.

K: So man is the result of time, not only evolutionary but chronological as well as psychological.

HS: Yes.

K: So he is the result of time: the past, the present and the future.

HS: Right.

K: Now, he lives mostly in the past.

HS: All right, mostly.

K: He is the past.

HS: All right.

K: No, no, I'll show it to you. He is the past because he lives in memory.

HS: Not totally.

K: Wait, sir. Follow it step by step. He lives in the past and therefore he thinks and examines and looks from the background of the past.

HS: Which is both good and bad.

K: No, no. We are saying good and bad. There is no good past or bad past. We are concerned with the past. Don't give it a name.

HS: All right.

K: Like calling it good or bad, then we are lost. He lives in the past, examines everything from the past and projects the future from the past. So he lives in the past, he is the past. And when he thinks of the future or the present, he thinks in terms of the past.

HS: All right. It seems to me that most of the time that is true but there are new perceptions that break through, new experiences that break through the whole momentum of the past.

K: New experiences break through only when there is an absence of the past.

HS: Well it seems to me it is like it is a merging of things that we perforce bring with us from the past, but bring to play upon the novelty, the newness of the present. And it is a fusion of those two.

K: Look, sir, if I want to understand something new I must look

at it with clear eyes. I can't bring the past with all the recognition process, with all the memories, and then translate what I see as new. Surely, surely, now just a minute: the man who invented the jet, must have forgotten, or be completely familiar with the propeller, and then there was an absence of knowledge in which he discovered the new.

HS: That's fine.

K: Wait, wait. It is not a question of, that's fine. That is the only way to operate in life. That is, I must be completely aware - there must be complete awareness of the past, an absence of the past, to see the new.

HS: All right.

K: Or to come upon the new.

HS: All right.

K: You are conceding reluctantly.

HS: I am conceding reluctantly because I think I see what you are saying, I think I agree with the point that you are making, but it is also true that one operates in terms of...

K: The past.

HS:... symbols that one has. And it is not as though we begin de novo.

K: De novo is not possible, but we have to begin de novo because life demands it, because we have lived in this way, accepting war, hatred, brutality, competition, and anxiety, guilt, all that we have accepted that, we live that way. I am saying to bring about a different quality, a different way of living the past must disappear.

HS: We must be open to the new.

K: Yes. Therefore the past must have no meaning.

HS: That I can't go along with.

K: That is what the whole world is objecting to. The established order says, I can't let go for the new to be. And the young people throughout the world say, let's revolt against the old. But they don't understand the whole complications of it. So they say, what have you given us, except examinations, job, and repetition of the old pattern - war and favourite wars, wars.

HS: Well you are pointing out, it seems to me, the importance of not being slaves to the past. And that's so true and I don't want to in any way...

K: The past being the tradition, the past being the pattern of morality, which is the social morality, which is not moral.

HS: But at the same time there is only one generation, namely ourselves, that separates the future generation from the cave man.

K: I agree with all that.

HS: If the cave man were to be totally rescinded we would start right now.

K: Oh, no, no. To break through the past, sir, demands a great deal of intelligence, a great deal of sensitivity to the past. You can't just break away from it.

HS: OK, I am convinced.

K: So the problem really, sir, is, can we live a different way.

HS: Here, here.

K: A different way in which there are no wars, no hatreds, in which man loves man, without competition, without division, saying you are a Christian, you are a Catholic, you are a Protestant, you are this. That's all so immature. It has no meaning. It's an

intellectual sophisticated division. And that is not a religious mind at all, that's not religion. A religious mind is a mind that has no hatred, that lives completely without fear, without anxiety, in which there is not a particle of antagonism. Therefore a mind that loves - that is a different dimension of living altogether. And nobody wants that.

HS: And in another sense everybody wants that.

K: But they won't go after it.

HS: They won't go after it?

K: No, of course not. They are distracted by so many other things, they are so heavily conditioned by their past, they hold on to it.

HS: But I think there are some who will go after it.

K: Wait sir, very few.

HS: The numbers don't matter.

K: The minority is always the most important thing.

HS: Krishnamurti, as I listen to you and try to listen through the word to what you are saying, it seems to me that what I hear is that first, I should work out and each of us should work out his own salvation, not leaning on authority outside; second, not to allow words to form a film between us and actual experience, not to mistake the menu for the meal; and third, not to let the past swallow up the present, take possession, to responding to a conditioning of the past, but rather to be always open to the new, the novel, the fresh. And finally, it seems to me you are saying something like the key to doing this is a radical reversal in our point of view. It is as though we were prisoners straining at the bars for the light, and looking for the glimpse of light that we see

out there and wondering how we can get out towards it, while actually the door of the cell is open behind us if only we would turn around, we could walk out into freedom. This is what is sounds to me like you are saying. Is this it?

K: A little bit, sir, a little bit.

HS: All right. What else? What other than that? Or if you want to amplify.

K: Sir, surely sir, in this is involved the everlasting struggle, conflict, man caught in his own conditioning, and straining, struggling, beating his head to be free. And again we have accepted with the help of religions and all the rest of the group that effort is necessary. That's part of life. To me that is the highest form of blindness, of limiting man to say, you must everlastingly live in effort.

HS: And you think...

K: Not, 'I think', it is so. Sir, it is not a question of thought. Thought is the most...

HS: Leave those two words and just say, we don't have to.

K: But to live without effort requires the greatest sensitivity and the highest form of intelligence. You don't just say, well I won't struggle, and become like a cow. But one has to understand how conflict arises, the duality in us, the fact of 'what is', and 'what should be', there is the conflict. If there is no 'what should be', which is ideological, which is non real, which is fiction, and see 'what is', and face it, live with it without the 'what should be', then there is no conflict at all. It's only when you compare, evaluate with 'what should be', and then look with 'what should be' at the 'what is', then conflict arises.

HS: There should be no tension between the ideal and the actual.

K: No ideal at all. Why should we have an ideal? The ideal is the most idiotic form of conceptual thing, why should I have an ideal? The fact is burning there, why should I have an ideal about anything?

HS: Well now once more when you speak like that it seems to me that you break it into an either/or.

K: No, no.

HS: Not the ideal but the actual where it seems to me the truth is somehow both of these.

K: Ah, no. Truth is not a mixture of the ideal and the 'what is', then you produce some melange of some dirt. There is only 'what is'. Sir, look, take a very simple example: we human beings are violent. Why should I have an ideal of non-violence? Why can't I deal with the fact?

HS: Of violence?

K: Of violence without non-violence. The ideal is an abstraction, is a distraction. The fact is I am violent, man is violent. Let's tackle that, let's come to grips with that and see if we can't live without violence.

HS: But can...

K: Please, there is no dualistic process in this. There is only the fact that I am violent, man is violent, and is it possible to be free of that. Why should I introduce the idealistic nonsense?

HS: No dualism, you say, no separation, and in your view is it the case that there is no separation?

K: Absolutely.

HS: Is there any separation, you, me?

K: Sir, wait, physically there is. You have got a black suit, are a fairer person than me, and so on.

HS: But you don't feel dualistic.

K: If I felt dualistic I wouldn't even sit down to discuss with you, then intellectually we play with each other.

HS: Right. Now perhaps we are saying the same thing, but always it comes out in my mind it's a both/and - we are both separate and united.

K: No. Sir, when you love somebody with your heart, not with your mind, do you feel separate?

HS: I do in some - I feel both. I feel both separate and together.

K: Then it is not love.

HS: I wonder because part of the joy of love is the relationship which involves in some sense, like Ramakrishna said, 'I don't want to be sugar, I want to eat sugar'.

K: I don't know Ramakrishna, I don't want any authority, I don't want to quote any bird.

HS: Don't get hung up on this.

K: Sir, no. I am dealing - we are dealing with facts, not with what somebody said. The fact is...

HS: That in love, part of the beauty and the glory of it, is the sense of unity embracing what in certain respects is separate.

K: Sir, just a minute, sir. Let's be a little more unromantic about it. The fact is when there is love between man and woman, in that is involved possession, domination, authority, jealousy, all that is involved in it. Of course there is. And comfort, sexual pleasure, and the remembrance. All that. A bundle of all that.

HS: And there's some positive things you have left out.

K: A bundle of all that. Is love jealousy? Is love pleasure? Is love desire? If it is pleasure it is merely the activity of thought, saying, 'Well, I slept with that woman, therefore she is mine' and the remembrance of all that. That's not love. Thought is not love. Thought breeds fear, thought breeds pain, thought breed pleasure, and pleasure is not love.

HS: Thought breeds only the negative?

K: What is the positive? What is the positive thing that thought produces, except mechanical things?

HS: A love poem.

K: Sir, love poem. What? The man feels something and puts it down. The putting down is irrelevant, merely a form of communication. But to feel it is nothing to do with thought. To translate it then it is necessary for thought. But to love...

HS: Thought and words can also give form to our feelings which would remain inchoate without them.

K: Now, is there...

HS: Bring them to resolution, to satisfying resolutions.

K: Is relationship a matter of thought?

HS: Not only, but thought can contribute to a relationship.

K: Thought is always the old, relationship is something new.

HS: Yes, but there are new thoughts.

K: Ah! There is no such thing as new thoughts. Forgive me to be so emphatic.

HS: No, I like it.

K: I don't think there is a new thought. Thought can never be free because thought is the response of memory, thought is the

response of the past.

HS: When a great poet comes through with the right words to articulate a new perception, nobody has before, not even god, has thought of those particular words.

K: That's a mere matter of a cunning gift of putting words together. But what we are talking about...

HS: A noble trade.

K: Ah, that's a minor thing. No, sir, that's a minor thing; the major thing is to see the beauty of life and see the immensity of it, and to love.

HS: There it ended, a conversation with Krishnamurti. But what ended was only the words, not the substance. For Krishnamurti was speaking, as always, of that life that has no end, and no beginning.

PARIS 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 22ND APRIL, 1969 TALKING WITH YOUNG PEOPLE ABOUT DESIRE, PAIN AND PLEASURE

K: Now shall we take up that point of pleasure and pain? It is really very interesting if you go into it. What is pleasure, what is pain, what is love. Shall we really discuss it thoroughly, deeply? Right.

What is pleasure, what to you is pleasure? To see a flower, to see a cloud, to see a girl, sex, to be praised, flattered, to feel superior, to feel that you have achieved your metier, and so on - pleasure is that. Which is, some kind of not only sensual pleasure of the senses, but also it is much more psychologically, isn't it?

Q: [In French] Pleasure is before all an agreeable sensation which procures us a certain inward security.

K: Yes, yes sir, that's it. Agreeable sensations. And if security can give that agreeable sensation you will hold on to it. Sex gives pleasure and you keep at it, you want it. And with that pleasure goes also pain, doesn't it? No? Can you separate the two and keep them completely apart? What do you say, sirs? I will only have pleasure and no pain at any time. That's what we want. And can that be maintained. And our relationship with others is based on that principle of pleasure: I like you, and I dislike another. You are my friend, and he is not my friend. The friend may have caused me discomfort, questioned me, distrusted me, talked against me. So can we keep the pleasure principle and the pain separate? Or they always go together.

Q: That's intellectual.

K: Is this intellectual? Because this is the obvious fact of live,

isn't it? I would like to have always pleasure and no pain at any time. Right? Can that happen? I like to always have friends who never question, doubt, ask, disbelieve what I say. And when they disbelieve I get hurt, I distrust. So can the two things be kept apart?

Q: If you completely isolate yourself from the world you may be able to have pleasure and nothing else.

K: Can you separate yourself from the world, isolate yourself from the world, live in a cave?

Q: Some people do.

K: Ah! But do you? I mean, after all what some people do has nothing to do with you. Therefore that means retiring from the world, withdrawing from the world, isolating yourself in your own imagination of what pleasure is. There are a great many neurotic people like that; hospitals are full of them.

So as a human being, you and I, not the monk outside there in the Himalayas, or in some cave, can we keep the two apart? If we cannot - and it cannot be - then what shall we do? That's the question, isn't it? Right sir? No? I want pleasure and I don't want pain. The more I ask for pleasure the greater the pain. No? So what shall I do? I want pleasure and I don't want pain. I resist pain and invite pleasure. Now how shall I meet these two, the pain and the pleasure principle?

Q: It is not a question of pleasure but desire.

K: Yes, it is not a question of pleasure but desire. Now what is desire? Go on sirs. What is desire?

Q: Searching for pleasure.

K: The looking for pleasure. No, desire by itself I am talking, not what desire does, what it wants. What is desire?

Q: [In French] It is to intervene in order to obtain something that we don't have.

K: No, sir. How does desire come into being?

Q: [In French] That's a thought, a sensation...

K: No, sir, before, wait sir, wait. Examine it, examine it a little bit.

Q: It is a reaction.

K: Now how does this reaction come?

Q: [In French] From being unsatisfied.

K: Watch it, sir, it is so simple.

Q: Perhaps the lack of pleasure.

K: No, sir, no sir.

Q: You see something, you want it.

K: No, look at it sir. I see there is this beautiful carpet - if it is beautiful, I am saying, let's call it beautiful! - and there is perception, right, the seeing of it, the touching of it, the sensation, and the desire to.. No? Right? The seeing, the contact, the sensation, and the desire. Right? I see a beautiful car, or a beautiful woman, or a beautiful furniture: sensation, desire.

Q: [In French] By desire we want to keep the pleasure for ever.

K: Yes. We are discussing desire, how it comes. Right? I see how it comes. Now watch it. Now what happens?

Q: [In French] What is the cause of this desire.

K: No, what happens then? I see a beautiful car: sensation, desire, then thought comes in and says, I wish I could own it. No? I wish I could have that chair. No? So when thought takes over desire, then it becomes pleasure or pain. No?

Q: What do you mean by 'takes over'?

K: What do I mean by 'take over'? One can see the car and say, how beautiful it is, and leave it there. But thought says, no, I would like to have it. Right? There thought sustains the desire, gives desire a continuity. Right? Right sir?

Q: There is not only a desire to get something, there is the desire to get away from something.

K: It's the same thing, sir. The same thing. The 'get away from something' is pain; desire for something is pleasure. Right? Can we go on from there? No, please be quite sure. Don't move away from that if we are not sure.

Q: Sometimes desire is an absence of something, not focussed on a specific object which is wanted, a feeling of something that isn't there without it.

K: Of course. I have had something very pleasurable yesterday, it isn't there and I want it.

Q: In that case you would know what it was.

K: Yes, of course.

Q: In some cases you might not be sure. But it's still desire.

K: But is this clear? Desire. How desire arises. Contact, perception, seeing, touching, sensation, then thought says, I wish I had it, or I wish it didn't happen to me. So thought begins the pleasure and the pain. Right? I am not trying to convince you of anything. You understand, sir? We are just examining. I am not your authority, because I am gone in a couple of days. Even if I am here I am not your authority anyhow. So that's a fact.

And then what am I to do? Thought is doing this all the time. Right? Encouraged by society, the environment in which I live, through magazines, posters, propaganda, the priests, it is doing that

all the time, thought is being influenced. And also thought says, I wish I had more of that pleasure, I want to become the chief minister. The same principle. You follow? I and the society encouraging each other. Right? So what shall I do? How shall I deal with this thing? How shall the mind tackle this thing? Must I live always in this duality? Right? Pleasure and pain. Battle, you follow? And that's what is called living. And is it possible to live differently and yet not smother pleasure? I don't know if you.. Not destroy pleasure, like the priests says, "I must have no pleasure, therefore I won't look at a woman, I won't have sex, I won't look at beautiful pictures, I won't look at the mountains. I will keep my eyes on Jesus and the book".

Q: Is it possible to choose?

K: No, no. Is it possible to choose? Pain or pleasure?

Q: [In French] Is it possible to follow or refuse thought, to try to stop it?

K: Look, sir, what you are asking. First let us see the exact state: desire, thought, pleasure, pain. And thought is always demanding pleasure and yet it is creating pain. Right? I think - I mean there is the thought of sexual pleasure, thinking about it, demanding it and being frustrated, and then anger, jealousy, which is the pain. Right? So shall the human life be spent in these opposites? What will you do? That's your problem. That's the problem. Now how will you deal with it? What will you do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please sir, do listen. Let's play this. There is nobody to tell you what to do. Right? No specialist, no authority, no gurus, nobody. How will you answer this question? How will you go

beyond it?

Q: [In French] I'm wondering if by following the process of desire in general, we'll face a particular desire, meet it, deal with it, rightly.

K: That means what?

Q: [In French] Talking in general may not be useful at all if we...

K: No, no, no. I am not talking of that. I am saying how will you solve this question, pleasure and pain? It's your baby, it's left in your hands. How will you solve it? It has nothing to do with me, it is yours. How will you solve this?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, you are not observing in yourself, if I may point out. Watch it in yourself sir. There is this principle going on inside, the pleasure and the pain. How will you deal with this?

Q: By being attentive.

K: Attentive to what?

Q: To what is around you, you don't go far unless you have attention.

Q: I think either you can say, yes, to pleasure and be ready to pay the price of pain for it, or you try to renounce both of them.

K: How can you renounce both of them? All that is an intellectual conception.

Q: I think you can say, I would like to have peace, and I know that you can have peace, you don't have to look for desire, you can have it.

K: Therefore you won't look at a tree, you won't look at the moon and the first slip of the moon?

Q: You can look at the moon without desiring it.

K: That's fairly easy, madam, the moon is very far away. But I see something very nice in front of me and I want it. You are not facing this thing.

Q: [In French] One cannot give up desire anyway.

Q: How does pain arise?

K: We said that. How pain arises is fairly clear. Thought. Thought. Thought thinks about something which has given pleasure and goes on thinking about it and sustains the pleasure. Right? Thought thinking of some danger that you have had, thinks about it, fear comes into it. It's clear. What will you do, sirs?

Q: Not think about it.

K: Then how will you stop thinking? You see, you are just speculating, you don't feel it. You have to solve it, you see. You are playing with words. I don't want to live between hate and love. Right? Hate being pain, and love, so-called love being pleasure. I don't want to live battling between these two for the rest of my life. So I must find some means of understanding this whole thing. What shall I do? Come on sirs, let's discuss it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Who is saying all this? Who is saying all this?

Q: [In French] When one lives, one sees that we are happy, unhappy, it's an illusion, often...

K: Yes sir, but who is saying it is an illusion?

Q: [In French] I open a Krishnamurti book which speaks about all that, and I revise my lesson.

K: But sir, you read something, you mean to say that helps you to understand this whole thing deeply and are free of this principle

of pain and pleasure. No, you don't get this, sir.

All right sirs, let's go into it. May we go into it? Let's go into it.

Q: When you have a special sensation, during this and seeing that it is probably pain, it wakes me up, I am aware of it when I feel it, when I am aware I feel it.

K: Pleasure?

Q: Yes.

K: Don't you feel the same when you are aware of pain?

Q: Yes.

K: Then what? Don't be aware of it?

Q: No. It wakes me. I don't know how to put it. It wakes one.

K: I don't quite understand this, sir, sorry.

Q: It wakes you up, this feeling of sensation of pleasure or pain. And you look at it, you are aware of it. It seems to me it is not pleasure or pain.

Q: He is saying sir, that when you are aware of pleasure it is no longer pleasure, and there is no longer pain.

K: You are saying, are you, sir, to be aware at the moment of pleasure and pain?

Q: Yes. Not by intention, just..

K: Just to be aware of it.

Q: Yes.

K: Neither discarding it, nor rejecting it.

Q: Yes.

K: Nor resisting it, nor inviting it. Just to be aware. Right? Have you done it?

Q: It happens.

K: Yes. I am not being cynical, sir, please. I am just saying,

have you done it. If you have then you know what it means to be aware. That is, to be aware without censor, without judgement, without choice. Right? That is to look without any choice. Right? Which means what?

Q: Looking at this as a fact.

K: As a fact, yes. No, then what happens? Go on! You see!

Q: [In French] One creates a distance between the desire itself that one observes as an object and oneself.

K: Sir, look, I have pleasure and pain. I have learnt now the trick of being aware. Right? A trick. So I know now what to do.

Q: Once you become aware that there is pleasure and pain, you just live with this awareness. And so you are quite conscious that when pain or pleasure comes, you are just aware of them and you don't do anything about them. You just understand them, and you don't go into them without knowing what you are doing.

K: Sir, he said just know, sir, please, he said, if you are aware another thing happens. Right?

Q: You are not..

K: You have told me that. I have learnt a trick. Right? The next time I have pleasure I know it is going to bring pain, therefore I am going to be aware. Look what has happened to me, what has happened to the mind. You are following what I am saying?

Q: Unaware, yes, we are unaware.

K: Go into it sir, you are not following it. I have learnt a clever trick of not suffering. Right? And what has happened to me? I am still as stupid as before. Now I have added a new trick. It's like a circus. Right? And there I am. Is that what pleasure and pain, is that all that it means? That I have learnt a trick not to suffer?

Q: When I say I don't want to live between pleasure and pain, this is already another desire created out of the imagination that there is another state of mind.

K: Yes, sir, quite right.

Q: But this is not the case. Seeing this, totally seeing this state of mind is awareness. But just to say I don't want to live between pleasure and pain doesn't..

K: I am just pointing out, sir, the danger of learning a new trick. You follow? That's all. I am not saying it is right, or wrong. I have learnt now how to meet pain. I won't go to church, I won't escape, I'll just become aware of it, a fact, and I am going to become aware. I am aware and it disappears. Right? At the end of that, then what?

Q: At least, you are not aware all the time, it is coming back.

K: So I have to learn that trick too. So I have to learn how to be aware all the time so as not to suffer. Which means not to have any pleasure either. Right? I can't put away one without the other. I must put both away. I don't know if you are meeting all this. So what shall I do? I am not going to learn any tricks because that is too stupid. I want to find out how to deal with a living thing. A living thing. Pleasure is a living thing, pain is a living thing. And if I have learnt some clever way of looking at it I approach it with a dead mind.

So I have learnt something: for a living thing I must also be alive to look at it, not learn a dead trick. Right? Now how shall I meet this thing, pleasure and pain? Not through trick. Right? So I have to learn about it because I have to learn about a living thing, not a dead thing. So can my mind - can the mind learn about a

living thing? And it can only learn about a living thing if it is not dead. Right, are you following? So when there is a conclusion that I must be aware then it is dead. Any form of conclusion is to destroy the mind. Right?

Q: Then it is not learning.

K: Then it is not learning. So I watch. I see the truth of that. I say, by Jove, any form of conclusion dulls the mind. Have I conclusions? Have I conclusions? I have and I say, I must be aware. So I am watching. Have I any conclusions, any beliefs - which are all conclusions - any conceptual ideology? So what has happened? So what has happened? Watch it, sir, look. Desire, pain and pleasure; then somebody said, be aware of it, old boy, and it will stop it, and I nearly swallowed that hook. You follow? And I say, ny Jove, I see the danger of that. So I see for a living thing I must have a very active mind, not a dull mind, not a dull feeling, or an habitual feeling. And have I habitual feelings? You follow how step by step I have gone to find out that I have got habitual, traditional feelings. Which dull the mind, therefore I don't understand pleasure and pain. I wonder if you are understanding all this?

So now I am going to learn about myself. I am not concerned about pleasure and pain. You understand now? I am concerned to see if there is any part of this whole being, which is the me, is dead, dull, stupid, not alive, has come to conclusions, and remains with those conclusions. So I am learning about myself now. I don't know if you are following? Desire, pleasure, pain, the trick of awareness, how the mind nearly caught in it, and therefore through all that I have learnt that I must look at myself to see if there is any

part of me that is dead.

Q: Isn't that another trick?

K: Is it? Learning. Learning isn't a trick. I am learning as I go along. Trick is something which I accept, a formula, and apply that formula in order to get rid of something. So this is not a trick because I am learning. I am learning about myself, upon which so many tricks have been played. Right sirs?

Q: [In French] One may be frightened of observing, studying oneself. One doesn't want to see one's own death.

K: Wait. So I want to learn about myself. Am I frightened to learn about myself? To see what I am, am I frightened? Why am I frightened? Watch it, sir. Why am I frightened? Because I have a conclusion about myself. I don't know if you follow this? I am frightened to see myself as I am because I have come to a conclusion I am a marvellous man. Or I am a very ugly man. So the conclusion, the ideal, breeds fear, not the fact. I don't know if you are meeting all this. Right? So I am learning about myself, not adding more conclusions. So I have learnt something, which is, I am afraid. I am afraid because I have an image about myself. Now why have I an image about myself? Haven't you an image about yourself? Why?

Q: [In French] Because of the conditioning, external life.

K: So you blame the image on the society? Is it? Or am I also building an image about myself all the time? Society says you must be a great success. And also to be successful gives me great pleasure. So it is a combination of both. No? So I am building an image about myself all the time based on pleasure and pain. I don't know if you are following all this. Right? No? So I have come

back. I have started in examining pleasure and pain, and I have found myself that all my life is based on this principle. Right, sirs? So where am I now? I only want pleasure and avoid pain. I study myself in order to attain greater pleasure. No? Which is called enlightenment, god, you follow, all the rest of it.

So: may I go a little further? Now I see that anything I attempt to learn about, about something, must be either to resist it or to derive pleasure. Right? So what is there to learn? What is learning then? If my whole structure is based on this principle, pleasure and pain, the past, the present and the future, what is there to learn? I don't think you are meeting this? I have learnt everything about myself. No? Right sir? No, are we meeting?

Q: [In French] You mean by the fact of understanding images we build all the time, this is learning?

K: Sir, look, we started with pleasure and pain, desire, thought, learning a formula which will stop. Then I am frightened to look at myself because I have an image about myself. The image says, don't look because you may find ugly things in you, and so be afraid of it, so don't look. The not looking is dictated by pleasure, not by fear.

Q: [In French] You say that one shouldn't have the desire for learning, but rather be surprised...

K: No, no. No, sir. Just follow it sir. If you have followed this inwardly you will see it. So I started out with pain and pleasure, and I find I am learning about myself. Right? And what is there to learn about myself? I have learnt. There has been a tremendous learning which is the mind very subtly wants pleasure and wanting to avoid pain, in different forms, in different

circumstances, different ambience and so on. That's what it wants. Superior, inferior, god, hell - you know. And I say, by Jove, I will observe only, not learn. You don't understand.

Q: Have I learnt everything about myself when I have seen this pleasure, that pleasure and pain are the same?

K: Yes, sir. You can add more details to it.

Q: Doesn't this rather simplify it?

K: I simplified it of course, purposefully because I can't go too much into it, but I am showing you something else which is, learning in order to have pleasure and avoid pain, which is what we are doing all the time, and that is not learning.

Q: So you say observe.

K: Observe.

Q: Who is observing?

K: That's just it. Wait. Go into a little bit. Who is the observer?

Q: Me.

K: Who is the me?

Q: It wants..

K: Who is the me?

Q: My thoughts.

K: My thoughts.

Q: My memories.

K: Yes.

Q: My image.

K: Image. Thought, which is memory, image which is memory, the 'me' is a bundle of memories. Right? Memories of dead things. So the 'me' is a dead thing. No? So the 'me' is looking at everything alive. I look at you who is alive, or the flowers, with a dead me

inside looking. No? I love you. Look at it, what has taken place there. The 'me' says, I love you. The 'me' with all the memories, the 'me' with all its thoughts which are dead, and love is a living thing, otherwise love is not a memory. I don't know if you are following all this. So when I say, "I love you", a dead thing is saying it to a living thing, and can a dead thing speak to a living thing? You don't see.

So can I - can the mind and the heart look, not with dead conclusions, memories, ideas, images, but look with something which is living, which is love. No? Don't agree, sir. You know this is real meditation, you know. Can it look at life, at my wife, husband, the neighbour, the world, with those eyes?

Q: When it is not looking it is not dissipating.

K: Then something else is taking place. If I look at you with my image about you, I am not looking at you. Right? My image about you is looking. Look at it, sir. A strange phenomena is going on. I have not only an image of you but I have an image about myself. So there are two images in me, and many more, but for the moment two. The you and the me. So I am looking with two images at you. And this looking is called relationship. Right? When I say, I love you, it means that - my image about myself and the image which I have built about you, and the images are obviously dead, adding to it or subtracting, but they are dead.

So can I - can the mind and the heart look without being dead? And then possibly only one can say, I love you. Now I have learnt, learnt, not just speculated. By investigating, looking at desire and all that I have learnt something enormous. Right? I have learnt - the mind has learnt to put away everything dead. Which means

tradition, image, you follow, wipe it clean.

Q: [In French] Why do I build these images?

K: Why does one build these images? That's fairly simple too. I come to you and say, oh, how very intelligent you are. Look, immediately you have built an image about it, haven't you? You like being flattered and you have an image, you are my friend. I say to you - I won't, not to you, sir, I say somebody is stupid. At that moment you have created an image. But if you are really attentive at that moment you won't have an image. I wonder if you see this. So when the mind is attentive there is freedom, when the mind is inattentive then there is immense... you follow? Then you will say, how am I to be attentive all the time. Right? Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Are you asking that question? Aren't you very greedy. When you say, how can I be attentive all the time, aren't you being greedy? And why are you asking it? Watch it sir. Why are you asking it?

Q: Because we expect pleasure from all this.

K: Exactly. So I spend - one spends most of one's life inattentive. Right? And occasionally attention. And I say, by Jove, if I could move this inattention to attention everything will be all right. Right? Now can that be done? Can inattention become attentive? You are following? It can't. You understand? The two are entirely two different states; one is asleep, the other is awake. How can the sleepy state become the other? It can't. Right? So what is to be done? Let there be attention in the sleepy state. Let me be aware, attentive that I am asleep. Right? Then I am attentive. I don't know if we are meeting?

So I have learnt a great deal. By one question, pleasure and pain, the mind has learnt a tremendous lot, which is enlightenment. To see things very clearly, with light, is enlightenment. But we won't go into that, that brings in quite a different problem.

Q: What problem does that bring in?

K: What problem does enlightenment bring? Enlightenment doesn't bring.

Q: The question of enlightenment.

K: The question of enlightenment. What is enlightenment? Right? You read books on Hindu religion?

Q: Sometimes.

K: Oh, my lord! I haven't read them so I am at a loss. You know what is enlightenment, what does it mean? To be a light to oneself. Light. And that light cannot be lit by another. Right? Do see this, sir, please. So no authority, nobody can light the light. In that light everything is seen very clearly; there is no illusion, there is no darkness, there is no shadow, there is no wish, there is no image. That's what it means to be an enlightened human being. So can the mind be free of all authority? All authority, not one particular authority of the police, but all authority inwardly, of every kind. Which means also the authority of knowledge, the authority of memory, the authority of experience. You follow, sir? The problem is tremendous, you have no idea.

Q: How can one escape the authority of oneself?

K: How can one escape from the authority of oneself. The authority of oneself is knowledge, experience. Isn't it? I have experienced - what, joy - that's the authority. Look what has happened: I have experienced joy, which is in the past. The past

then becomes the authority. You don't say in the state of experiencing, I have experienced. I don't know if you are following all this. Are we meeting each other? While we are looking at the sunset, the beauty of it, the colour of it, the joy of it, in that moment you say, I am experiencing great delight. You don't say that. You only say it when it is over and when you have remembered it, and then tell somebody. So the authority of one's own experience is the dead authority of yesterday, therefore valueless. Right?

So to have no authority means to be free from yesterday: knowledge, experience and so on. Unless you go into this very, very deeply, this is all just words.

Is that enough?

Q: We came to the point where we saw that if we were learning with a motive then that is not learning at all. And then you spoke about love and you spoke about other things, but could we go back to that point then?

K: Which one sir?

Q: If you were learning with a motive then you are not really learning at all.

K: Sir, there are two different kinds of learning, aren't there. The learning of a language, a technique, there is a certain motive. I want to learn a technique in order to earn a livelihood, money, a job. Right? In learning about myself why should I have a motive? If I have a motive, that motive is based on pleasure and pain. However subtle. So the moment I have pleasure and pain as the motive I am not learning. Then what is the other, sir, love?

Q: Instead of the motive there could be something else which is

love, which makes it possible to learn.

K: Sir, don't let's use the word learn. Then we have to go into this question of what love is. Right? Is love pleasure, is love desire? Is love jealousy, is love ambition, competition, hatred, nationality? Can a mind that is nationalistic, class minded, that is acquisitive, possessive, you follow all this, can such a mind love, or the heart love? And we are all that. So is it possible for the mind not to have measure at all? Because I measure myself, compare myself with you who are clever, who are loving, kind, noble, etc., etc., and I say, by Jove, I wish I could be like that. Which is part of envy. So can the mind be free of all measurement, comparison? Sir I can go into all this, but you see unless you do it, it is no fun at all.

Q: [In French] Do you think it is possible to speak about love?

K: No. What is not love? Hate is not love. Now, and we do hate, we create enmity, we do. So can the mind never have hate at all? So I have forgotten the question of love. I am now interested to see if the mind can be free of hate, anger, jealousy, competition. When this thing is not the other is. Through negation the positive is, but not in the pursuit of the positive, it doesn't come.

So we had better stop. I am sorry we have to stop.

SAANEN 2ND CONVERSATION WITH SWAMI VENKATESANANDA 26TH JULY 1969

Swami Venkatesananda: Will you forgive me, Krishnaji, if I inflict myself on you for a little while more? We are sitting near each other and enquiring, listening and learning. Even so did the sage and the seeker, and that is the origin they say of the Upanishads. These Upanishads contain what are known as Mahavakyas, Great Sayings, which perhaps had the same effect upon the seeker then as your words have upon me now. May I beg of you to say what you think of them, are they still valid, or do they need revision or renewal?

I'll say what Mahavakyas are: Prajnanam Brahma, or as it is usually translated: consciousness is infinite, the absolute, the highest Truth. Aham Brahmasmi: I am that infinite, or I is that infinite, because the 'I' here does not refer to the ego. Tat Tvam-asi: Thou art that. Ayam Atma Brahma: The self is the infinite, or the individual is the infinite.

These were the four Mahavakyas used by the ancient sage to bring home the message to the student, and they were also sitting just like us, face to face, the guru and the disciple, the sage and the seeker.

Krishnaji: Yes, what is the question, sir?

Swamiji: What do you think of them? Are these Mahavakyas valid now? Do they need a revision or a renewal?

Krishnaji: These sayings, like "I am that", "Tat-Tvam-asi" and the other thing, what was that?

Swamiji: Prajnanam Brahma, that is: consciousness is Brahman.

Krishnaji: Isn't there a danger, sir, of repeating something not knowing what it means? "I am that." What does it actually mean?

Swamiji: Thou art that.

Krishnaji: Thou art that. What does that mean? One can say, I am the river. That river that has got tremendous volume behind it of water, moving, restless, pushing on and on, through many countries. I can say, "I am that river." That would be equally valid as, "I am Brahman."

Swamiji: Yes. Yes.

Krishnaji: Why do we say, "I am that"? And not the river, or the poor man, or the man that has no capacity, no intelligence, dull, this dullness brought about by heredity, by poverty, by degradation, all that! Why don't we say, "I am that also"? Why do we always attach ourselves to something which we suppose to be the highest?

Swamiji: 'That', perhaps, only means that which is unconditioned: Yo Vai Bhuma Tatsukham. That which is unconditioned.

Krishnaji: Unconditioned, yes.

Swamiji: So, since there is in us this urge to break all conditioning, we look for the unconditioned.

Krishnaji: Can a conditioned mind, can a mind that is small, petty, narrow, living on superficial entertainments, can that know or conceive, or understand, or feel, or observe the unconditioned?

Swamiji: No. But it can uncondition itself.

Krishnaji: That is all it can do.

Swamiji: Yes.

Krishnaji: Not say, "There is the unconditioned, I am going to

think about it", or "I am that". My point is, if I may point out, why is it that we always associate ourselves with what we think is the highest, and not what we think is the lowest?

Swamiji: Perhaps in Brahman there is no division between the highest and the lowest, that which is unconditioned.

Krishnaji: That's the point. When you say, "I am that", or "Thou are that", there is a statement of a supposed fact...

Swamiji: Yes.

Krishnaji:... which may not be a fact at all.

Swamiji: Perhaps I should explain here again that the sage who uttered the Mahavakyas was believed to have had a direct experience of it.

Krishnaji: Now, if he had the experience of it, could he convey it to another?

Swamiji: (Laughs)

Krishnaji: And also, sir, the question also arises, can one actually experience something which is not experienceable? We use the word 'experience' so easily - 'realize', 'experience', 'attain', 'self-realization', all these things - can one actually experience the feeling of supreme ecstasy? Let's take that for the moment, that word. Can one experience it? Wait sir, wait.

As you say, the infinite, can one experience the infinite? This is really quite a fundamental question, not only here but in life. We can experience something which we have already known. I experience meeting you. That's an experience, meeting you, or you meeting me, or my meeting X. And when I meet you next time I recognize you, don't I? I say, "Yes, I met him at Gstaad." So there is in experience the factor of recognition.

Swamiji: Yes. That is objective experience.

Krishnaji: If I hadn't met you I wouldn't experience, I'd go by, you'd pass me by. There is in all experiencing, isn't there, a factor of recognition?

Swamiji: Possibly.

Krishnaji: Otherwise it is not an experience. I meet you - is that an experience?

Swamiji: Objective experience.

Krishnaji: It can be an experience, can't it? I meet you for the first time. Then what takes place in that first meeting of two people? What takes place?

Swamiji: An impression, impression of like.

Krishnaji: An impression of like or dislike, such as, "He's a very intelligent man", or "He's a stupid man", or "He should be this or that". It is all based on my background of judgment, on my values, on my prejudices, likes and dislikes, on my bias, on my conditioning, the background. That background meets you and judges you. The judgment, the evaluation, is what we call experience.

Swamiji: But isn't there, Krishnaji, another...

Krishnaji: Wait, sir, let me finish this. Experience is after all the response to a challenge, isn't it? The reaction to a challenge. I meet you and I react. If I didn't react at all, with any sense of like, dislike, prejudice, what would take place?

Swamiji: Yes?

Krishnaji: What would happen in a relationship in which the one - you, perhaps - have no prejudice, no reaction; you are living in quite a different state and you meet me. Then what takes place?

Swamiji: Peace.

Krishnaji: I must recognize that peace in you, that quality in you, otherwise I just pass you by. So when we say, "Experience the highest", can the mind, which is conditioned, which is prejudiced, frightened, experience the highest?

Swamiji: Obviously not.

Krishnaji: Obviously not. And the fear, the prejudice, the excitement, the stupidity is the entity that says, "I am going to experience the highest." When that stupidity, fear, anxiety, conditioning ceases, is there experiencing of the highest at all?

Swamiji: Experiencing of 'that'.

Krishnaji: No, I haven't made myself clear. If the entity, which is the fear, the anxiety, the guilt and all the rest of it, if that entity has dissolved itself from fear and so on, what is there to experience?

Swamiji: Now that beautiful question was actually put in just so many words, by another sage. He asked the very same question: Vijnataram Are Kena Vijaniyat: "You are the knower, how can you know the knower?" "You are the experiences!"

But there is one suggestion that Vedanta gives and that is: we have so far been talking about an objective experience: Paroksanubhuti. Isn't there another experience? Not my meeting X Y Z, but the feeling 'I am', which is not because I meet desire somewhere, or because I confronted desire somewhere else. I don't even go and ask a doctor or somebody to certify that 'I am'. But there is this feeling, there is this knowledge, 'I am'. This experience seems to be totally different from objective experience.

Krishnaji: Sir, what is the purpose of experience?

Swamiji: Exactly what you have been saying: to get rid of the fears, and get rid of all the complexes, all the conditioning. To see what I am, in truth, when I am not conditioned.

Krishnaji: No, sir. I mean: I am dull.

Swamiji: Am I dull?

Krishnaji: I am dull; and because I see you, or X Y Z, who is very clever, very bright, very intelligent...

Swamiji:... there is comparison.

Krishnaji: Comparison: through comparing, I find myself that I am very dull. And I say, "Yes, I am dull, what am I to do?", and just remain in my dullness. Life comes along, an incident takes place, which shakes me up. I wake up for a moment and struggle, struggle not to be dull, to be a little more intelligent, and so on. So experience generally has the significance of waking you up, giving you a challenge to which you have to respond. Either you respond to it adequately, or inadequately. If it is inadequate, the response then becomes a medium of pain, struggle, fight, quarrel, you know. But if you respond to it adequately, that is fully, you are the challenge. You are the challenge, not the challenged, but you are that. Therefore you need no challenge at all, if you are adequately responding all the time to everything.

Swamiji: That is beautiful, but (laughing) how does one get there?

Krishnaji: Ah, wait, sir. Just let us see the need for experience at all. I think this is really extraordinary, if you can go into it. Why do human beings demand not only objective experience, which one can understand - in going to the moon they have collected a lot of information, a lot of data, a lot of...

Swamiji:... rocks.

Krishnaji: That kind of experience is perhaps necessary, because it furthers knowledge, knowledge of factual, objective things. Now apart from that kind of experience, is there any necessity for experience at all?

Swamiji: Subjectively?

Krishnaji: Yes. I don't like to use 'subjective' and 'objective'. Is there the need of experience at all? We have said: experience is the response to a challenge. I challenge you, I ask, 'Why?' You may respond to it, and say, "Yes, perfectly right, I am with you." Why? But the moment there is any kind of resistance to that question, 'Why?', you are already responding inadequately. And therefore there is conflict between us, between the challenge and the response. Now, that's one thing. Now there is a desire to experience, let's say god, something supreme, the highest - the highest happiness, the highest ecstasy, bliss, a sense of peace, whatever you like. Can the mind experience it at all?

Swamiji: No.

Krishnaji: Then what does experience it?

Swamiji: Do you want us to enquire what the mind is?

Krishnaji: No.

Swamiji: What the 'I' is?

Krishnaji: No! Why does the 'I', me or you, or they or we, demand experience? - that is my point - demand the experience of the highest, which promises happiness, or ecstasy, bliss or peace?

Swamiji: Obviously because in the present state we feel inadequate.

Krishnaji: That's all. That's all.

Swamiji: Correct.

Krishnaji: Being in a state in which there is no peace, we want to experience a state which is absolute, permanent, eternal peace.

Swamiji: It is not so much that I am restless, and there is a state of peace; I want to know what is this feeling, "I am restless". Is the 'I' restless, or is the 'I' dull? Am I dull, or is dullness only a condition which I can shake off?

Krishnaji: Now who is the entity that shakes it off?

Swamiji: Wakes up. The 'I' wakes up.

Krishnaji: No, sir. That's the difficulty. Let's finish this first. I am unhappy, miserable, laden with sorrow. And I want to experience something which has no sorrow. That is my craving. I have an ideal, a principle, an end, which by struggling towards it I will ultimately get that. That's my craving. I want to experience that and hold on to that experience. That is what human beings want - apart from all the clever sayings, clever coverings.

Swamiji: Yes, yes; and that is perhaps the reason why another very great South Indian sage said: Asai Arumin Asai Arumin Isanodayinum Asai Arumin. It's very good really.

Krishnaji: What's that?

Swamiji: He said, "Cut down all these cravings. Even the craving to be one with god, cut it down", he says.

Krishnaji: Yes, I understand. Now wait a minute. If I, if the mind can free itself from this agony, then what is the need of asking for an experience of the supreme? There won't be.

Swamiji: No. Certainly.

Krishnaji: It is no longer caught in its own conditioning. Therefore it is something else; it is living in a different dimension.

Therefore the desire to experience the highest is essentially wrong.

Swamiji: If it is a desire.

Krishnaji: Whatever it is! How do I know the highest? Because the sages have talked of it? I don't accept the sages. They might be caught in illusion, they might be talking nonsense or sense. I don't know; I am not interested. I find that as long as the mind is in a state of fear, it wants to escape from it, and it projects an idea of the supreme, and wants to experience that. But if it frees itself from its own agony, then it is altogether in a different state. It doesn't even ask for the experience because it is at a different level.

Swamiji: Quite, quite.

Krishnaji: Now, why do the sages, according to what you have said, say, "You must experience that, you must be that, you must realize that"?

Swamiji: They didn't say, "You must".

Krishnaji: Put it any way you like. Why should they say all these things? Would it not be better to say, "Look here, my friends, get rid of your fear. Get rid of your beastly antagonism, get rid of your childishness, and when you have done that..."

Swamiji:... nothing more remains.

Krishnaji: Nothing more. You'll find out the beauty of it. You don't have to ask, then.

Swamiji: Fantastic, fantastic!

Krishnaji: You see, sir, the other way is such a hypocritical state; it leads to hypocrisy. I am seeking God, but I am all the time kicking people. (Laughs)

Swamiji: Yes, that could be hypocrisy.

Krishnaji: It is, it is.

Swamiji: That leads me on to the last and perhaps very impertinent question.

Krishnaji: No, sir, there is no impertinence.

Swamiji: I am neither flattering you, nor insulting you, Krishnaji, when I say that it is a great experience to sit near you and talk to you like this. Your message is great, and you have been talking for over forty years of things you have considered very important to man. Now three questions. Do you think a man can communicate it to another man? Question number one. Do you think that others can communicate it to still others? If so, how?

Krishnaji: Communicate what, sir?

Swamiji: This message, that you have dedicated your life to. What would you call it? You may call it message.

Krishnaji: Yes, call it what you like, it doesn't matter. Am I, the person who is speaking, is he conveying a message, telling you a message?

Swamiji: No. You may call it an awakening, a questioning.

Krishnaji: No, no. I am asking, sir. Just look at it.

Swamiji: I guess we feel so, the listeners.

Krishnaji: What is he saying? He says, "Look, look at yourself."

Swamiji: Exactly.

Krishnaji: Nothing more.

Swamiji: Nothing more is necessary.

Krishnaji: Nothing more is necessary. Look at yourself. Observe yourself. Go into yourself, because in this state as we are, we will create a monstrous world. You may go to the Moon, you may go further, to Venus, Mars and all the rest of it, but you will always carry yourself over there. Change yourself first! Change

yourself - not first - change yourself. Therefore to change, look at yourself, go into yourself, observe, listen, learn. That's not a message. You can do it yourself if you want to.

Swamiji: But somebody has to tell...

Krishnaji: I am telling you. I say, "Look, look at this marvellous tree; look at this beautiful African flower."

Swamiji: Till you said that, I hadn't looked at it.

Krishnaji: Ah! Why?

Swamiji: (Laughs)

Krishnaji: Why? It is there, round you.

Swamiji: Yes.

Krishnaji: Why didn't you look?

Swamiji: There could be a thousand answers.

Krishnaji: No, no. I asked you to look at that flower. By my asking you to look at that flower, do you look at that flower?

Swamiji: I have the opportunity, yes.

Krishnaji: No. Do you really look at that flower because somebody asks you to look at that flower?

Swamiji: No.

Krishnaji : No, you can't. That's just it. I say to you, "You are hungry." Are you hungry because I say it?

Swamiji: No.

Krishnaji: You know when you are hungry. Now you know when you are hungry but yet you want somebody to tell you to look at the flower.

Swamiji: I may know when I am hungry, but it is the mother that tells me where the food is.

Krishnaji: No, no. We're not talking about where the food is, but

we are saying 'hunger'. You know when you're hungry. But why should somebody tell you to look at a flower?

Swamiji: Because I am not hungry to look at the flower.

Krishnaji: Why not?

Swamiji: I am satisfied with something else.

Krishnaji: No. Why aren't you looking at that flower? Why? I think first of all nature has no value at all for most of us. We say, "Well, I can see the tree any time I want to." That's one thing. Also, we are so concentrated upon our own worries, our own hopes, our own desires and experiences, that we shut ourselves in a cage of our own thinking; and we don't look beyond it. He says, "Don't do that. Look at everything and through looking at everything you'll discover your cage." That's all.

Swamiji: Isn't that a message?

Krishnaji: It is not a message in the sense...

Swamiji: No.

Krishnaji: It doesn't matter what you call it - call it a message. All right. I tell you that. You play with it, or take it very seriously. And if it is very serious for you, you naturally tell it to somebody else. You don't have to say, "I am going to make propaganda about it."

Swamiji: No, no.

Krishnaji: You will say, "Look at the beauty of those flowers."

Swamiji: Yes.

Krishnaji: You say that. And the person doesn't listen to you. He says, "What are you talking about, I want a whisky". And there it is - finished! So is propaganda necessary?

Swamiji: Propagation, sir.

Krishnaji: Yes, propagation, that is what, propagate. To bring out, to cultivate.

Swamiji: Cultivation is necessary.

Krishnaji: All these questions are rather... What do you say, sir?

Swamiji: I don't know.

Krishnaji: What are we talking about? What is it we are talking about?

Swamiji: Yes. We are talking about these forty years of talking.

Krishnaji: More than forty years.

Swamiji: Yes, millions of people have been talking for centuries, wasting their...

Krishnaji: For forty five years we have been talking, yes. We have been propagating...

Swamiji: Or something which is extremely important, which I'm sure you consider is extremely important.

Krishnaji: Otherwise I wouldn't talk.

Swamiji: Exactly. I hope you will forgive me for all this impertinence. I have read some of the books you have published, but this experience of sitting and talking to you...

Krishnaji:... is different from reading a book.

Swamiji: Completely, completely, different!

Krishnaji: I agree.

Swamiji: Last night I read one and there was a little more meaning. How does one bring that about?

Krishnaji: All right, sir. You are a serious person, and the other person being serious there is a contact, there is a relationship, there is a coming together in seriousness. But if you're not serious, you will just say, "Well, it's very nice talking about all these things, but

what's it all about?", and walk away.

Swamiji: Yes.

Krishnaji: Surely, sir, with any kind of relationship that has meaning there must be a meeting at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity, otherwise there is no communication, there is no relationship. And perhaps that's what takes place when we are sitting together here. Because one feels the urgency of something and the intensity of it, there is a relationship established which is quite different from reading a book.

Swamiji: A book has no life.

Krishnaji: Printed words have no life, but you can give life to the printed word if you are serious.

Swamiji: So how does it go on from there?

Krishnaji: From there you say, is it possible to convey to others this quality of urgency, this quality of intensity, and action which is always taking place now?

Swamiji: Really now?

Krishnaji: Yes, not tomorrow or yesterday.

Swamiji: Action, which means observation at the same level.

Krishnaji: And is always functioning - seeing and acting, seeing, acting, seeing, acting.

Swamiji: Yes.

Krishnaji: How is this to take place? First of all, sir, very few people, as we said yesterday, about ninety-five per cent are not interested in all this.

Swamiji: Five per cent more!

Krishnaji: Five per cent more since yesterday. Quite right! Most of them are not interested. They play with it. There are very, very

few really serious people. Ninety-five per cent say, "Well, if you are entertaining it's all right, but if you are not, you're not welcome" - entertainment, according to their idea of entertainment. Then what will you do? Knowing there are only very, very few people in the world who are really desperately serious, what will you do? You talk to them, and you talk to the people who want to be entertained. But you don't care whether they listen to you or don't listen.

Swamiji: Thank you. Thank you.

Krishnaji: Either. I don't say, to the people who need crutches, offer crutches!

Swamiji: No.

Krishnaji: Nor to the people who want comfort, an avenue of escape - 'Go away somewhere else.'

Swamiji: To the Palace Hotel!

Krishnaji: I think, sir, that is perhaps what has taken place in all these religions, all the so-called teachers. They have said, "I must help this man, that man, that other man."

Swamiji: Yes.

Krishnaji: The ignorant, the semi-ignorant, and the very intelligent. Each must have his particular form of food. They never said, "All right, I am not concerned. I just offer the flower, let them smell it, let them destroy it, let them cook it, let them tear it to pieces. I have nothing to do with it."

Swamiji: Well, they glorify that other attitude, the Bodhisattva ideal.

Krishnaji: Again, the Bodhisattva ideal - is it not an invention of our own desperate hope, desire for some kind of solace? The

Maitreya Bodhisattva, the idea that He has relinquished the ultimate in life, enlightenment, and is waiting for all humanity, or part of humanity...

Swamiji: Thank you.

Krishnaji: What is actually Vedanta?

Swamiji: The word means, 'The end of the Vedas'.

Krishnaji: Yes, Vedanta, the end of the Vedas.

Swamiji: The word.

Krishnaji: Sir, that's just it! End of the Vedas.

Swamiji: Not in the manner of 'full stop'.

Krishnaji: I am saying it is the end of all knowledge.

Swamiji: The goal of it.

Krishnaji: Veda is what they have talked about.

Swamiji: Knowledge.

Krishnaji: Knowledge, that means the end of knowledge.

Swamiji: Quite right, quite right. Yes, the end of knowledge; where knowledge matters no more.

Krishnaji: Therefore, leave it.

Swamiji: Yes.

Krishnaji: Why proceed from there to describe what it is not?

Swamiji: As I've been sitting and listening to you, I've thought of another sage who is reported to have gone to another greater one. And he says, "Look my mind is restless; please tell me what must I do." And the older man says, "Give me a list of what you know already, so that I can proceed from there." He replies, "Oh, it will take a long time, because I have all the formulas, all the shastras, all of that." The sage answers, "But that's only a set of words. All those words are contained in the dictionary, it means

nothing. Now what do you know?" He says, "That is what I know. I don't know anything else."

Krishnaji: Vedanta, as it says, means the end of knowledge.

Swamiji: Yes, it's wonderful, I never thought of it before: the end of knowledge.

Krishnaji: Freedom from knowledge.

Swamiji: Yes indeed.

Krishnaji: Then why have they not kept to that?

Swamiji: Their contention is that you have to pass through it in order to come out of it.

Krishnaji: Pass through what?

Swamiji: Through all this knowledge, all this muck, and then discard it. Parivedya Lokan Lokajitan Brahmano Nirvedamayat. That is, "After examining all these things and finding that they are of no use to you, then you must step out of it."

Krishnaji: Wait a minute, sir. Then why must I acquire it? If Vedanta means the end of knowledge, which the word itself means, the ending of Vedas, which is knowledge, then why should I go through all the laborious process of acquiring knowledge, and then discarding it?

Swamiji: Otherwise you wouldn't be in Vedanta. The end of knowledge is, having acquired this knowledge, coming to the end of it.

Krishnaji: Why should I acquire it?

Swamiji: Well, so that it can be ended.

Krishnaji: No, no. Why should I acquire it? Why should not I, from the very beginning, see what knowledge is and discard it?

Swamiji: See what knowledge is?

Krishnaji: And discard, discard all that: never accumulate.

Vedanta means the end of accumulating knowledge.

Swamiji: That's it. That's correct.

Krishnaji: Then why should I accumulate?

Swamiji: Pass through, perhaps.

Krishnaji: Pass through? Why should I? Knowledge: I know fire burns. I know when I am hungry I must eat. I know I mustn't hit you; I don't hit you, therefore I don't hit you. I don't go through the process of hitting you, acquiring the knowledge that I'll be hurt again. So each day I discard. I free myself from what I have learnt, every minute. So every minute is the end of knowledge.

Swamiji: Yes, right.

Krishnaji: Now if you and I accept that, that is a fact, that's the only way to live, otherwise you can't live. Then why have they said, "You must go through all the knowledge, through all this?" Why don't they tell me, "Look my friend, as you live from day to day acquiring knowledge, end it each day"? - not Vedanta.

Swamiji: No, no.

Krishnaji: Live it!

Swamiji: Quite right. Again this division, classification.

Krishnaji: That's just it. We are back again.

Swamiji: Back again.

Krishnaji: We're back again to a fragment, the fragmentation of life.

Swamiji: Yes. But I'm too dull, I can't get there; so I'd rather acquire all this.

Krishnaji: Yes, and then discard it.

Swamiji: In the religious or spiritual history of India, there have

been sages who were born sages: the Ramana Maharishi, the Shuka Maharishi, etc., etc. Well, they were allowed to discard knowledge even before acquiring it. And in their cases of course, the usual argument was that they had done it all...

Krishnaji: In their past lives.

Swamiji:... in their past lives.

Krishnaji: That's just it, sir. No, sir, apart from the acquiring of knowledge and the ending of knowledge, what does Vedanta say?

Swamiji: Vedanta describes the relationship between the individual and the Cosmic.

Krishnaji: The Eternal.

Swamiji: The Cosmic, or the Infinite, or whatever it is. It starts well: *Isavasyam Idam Sarvam Yat Kimcha Jagatyam Jagat*: "Till the whole universe is pervaded by that one..."

Krishnaji: That one thing.

Swamiji:... and so on. And then it's mostly this, a dialogue between a master and his disciple.

Krishnaji: Sir, isn't it extraordinary, there has always been in India this teacher and disciple, teacher and disciple?

Swamiji: Yes, Guru.

Krishnaji: But they never said, "You are the teacher as well as the pupil."

Swamiji: Occasionally they did.

Krishnaji: But always with hesitation, with apprehension. But why? The fact is, you are the teacher and you are the pupil. Otherwise you are lost, if you depend on anybody else. That's one factor. And also I would like to ask why, in songs, in Hindu literature, they have praised the beauty of nature, the trees, the

flowers, the rivers, the birds. Why is it most people in India have no feeling for all that?

Swamiji: Because they are dead?

Krishnaji: Why? And yet they talk about the beauty, the literature, they quote Sanskrit, and Sanskrit itself is the most beautiful language. They have lost it.

Swamiji: They have no feeling for...

Krishnaji: Why? And they have no feeling for the poor man.

Swamiji: Yes, that is the worst tragedy of all.

Krishnaji: I know. The squalor, the dirt.

Swamiji: And heaven knows from where they got this idea because it is not found in any of the scriptures. That means we are repeating the scriptures without realizing their meaning.

Krishnaji: That's it.

Swamiji: Even Krishna says: Ishwara Sarvabhutanam Hriddessaerjuna isthati, "I am seated in the hearts of all beings." Nobody bothers about the hearts of all beings. What would you think is the cause? They repeat it daily, every morning they are asked to repeat a chapter of the Bhagavad Gita.

Krishnaji: Every morning they do Puja and the repetition of things.

Swamiji: Now why have they lost the meaning? Obviously great meaning was put into those words by the authors. We are even asked to repeat them every day in order that we might keep...

Krishnaji: Alive.

Swamiji: Keep them alive. When and how did I kill the spirit? How was it possible? And naturally, how to prevent it?

Krishnaji: What do you think is the reason, sir? No, you know

India better.

Swamiji: I am shocked at it.

Krishnaji: Why do you think it happens? Is it over population?

Swamiji: No, overpopulation is a result, not the cause.

Krishnaji: Yes. Is it that they have accepted this tradition, this authority?

Swamiji: But the tradition says something good.

Krishnaji: But they have accepted it, therefore they never questioned it. Sir, I have seen M.A's and B.A's in India, who have passed degrees, are clever, brainy, but they wouldn't know how to put a flower on a table. They know nothing but memory, memory, the cultivation of memory. Isn't that one of the causes?

Swamiji: Perhaps. Mere memorizing.

Krishnaji: Memorizing everything.

Swamiji: Without thinking. Why does man refuse to think?

Krishnaji: Oh, that's different: indolence, fear, wanting always to tread the traditional path so that he doesn't go wrong.

Swamiji: But we have discarded the tradition which they say didn't suit us.

Krishnaji: Of course. But we find a new tradition that suits us, and therefore keeps us safe.

Swamiji: We never felt that the healthy tradition is a good tradition to keep.

Krishnaji: Throw out all tradition! Begin! Let's find out, sir, whether these teachers and gurus and sages, have really helped people. Has Marx really helped people?

Swamiji: No.

Krishnaji: They have imposed their ideas on them.

Swamiji: And others have used the same ideas.

Krishnaji: Therefore I question this whole thing, because they are really not concerned with people's happiness.

Swamiji: Though they say so.

Krishnaji: If the Marxists and all those Soviet leaders are really interested in the people - people - then there would be no concentration camps. There would be freedom. There would be no repressive measures.

Swamiji: But I suppose they think, we have to imprison the lunatics.

Krishnaji: That's it. The lunatic is a man who questions my authority. The authority of the Soviets, the authority of whatever it is.

Swamiji: Yesterday's ruler might be today's lunatic.

Krishnaji: That always happens, that's inevitable, that's why I'm asking, whether it's not important to make man, a human being, realize that he's solely responsible.

Swamiji: Each one.

Krishnaji: Absolutely! For what he does, what he thinks, how he acts. Otherwise we end up in this memorizing, and complete blindness.

Swamiji: That is your message. And how to nail it?

Krishnaji: By driving it in every day (laughs). And driving it into oneself. Because man is so eager to put his responsibility on others. The army is the safest escape, because I'm told what to do. I don't have any responsibility. They have all thought it out, what I should do, what I should think, how I should act, how I should carry the gun, how I should shoot - and finished! They provide me

with a meal, sleeping-quarters, and for sex you can go to the village. That's the end of it. And strangely they talk about Karma.

Swamiji: That is Karma. Prarabdha Karma.

Krishnaji: They insist on Karma.

Swamiji: That is Karma. I was a Brahmin, and I know what happened. We played with that Karma and then it came back on us.

Krishnaji: Playing havoc now in India.

Swamiji: We toyed with the idea of Karma and we said: it's your Karma, you must suffer. My Karma is good and so I'm divorced from it all; I'm the landlord. And now they have turned the tables.

Krishnaji: Quite.

Swamiji: I asked someone who was a vegetarian - she's a fanatical vegetarian - someone asked, "Is pure vegetarianism absolutely necessary for yoga practice?" I said, "Not so important. Let's talk about something else." And she was horrified. She came back to me and said, "How can you say that? You can't say that vegetarianism is of secondary value. You must say it's of primary value." I replied, "Forgive me. I said something, but it doesn't matter." I then asked her, "Do you believe in war, defence forces, defending your country and so on?" "Yes," she said, "otherwise how can we live - we have to." I replied, "If I call you a cannibal, how do you react to that? This man kills a small animal to sustain his life, but you are willing to kill people to sustain yours. Like a cannibal." She didn't like that - but I think she saw the point later.

Krishnaji: Good.

Swamiji: It's so fantastic. People don't want to think. And I suppose with you, Krishnaji, if you say the truth, you become very

unpopular. A priest said: Apriyasya Tu Pathyasya Vakta Shrota Na Vidyate. Very beautiful! "People love to hear pleasant things; pleasant to say and pleasant to hear." If you say something which is not so pleasant, but if it is the truth, one doesn't want to say and one doesn't want to hear it.

ROME 1ST PUBLIC TALK 4TH NOVEMBER 1969 CAN THE HUMAN MIND BE FREE FROM ITS CONDITIONING?

Krishnamurti: Do you know what is happening all over the world? The same phenomena. Even in the so-called Eastern Bloc there is also the questioning, doubting. And when one is confronted with all this, one asks, what is one to do? What can a human being confronted with this phenomenon of deterioration, of degeneration - what is one, as a human being, actually to do? Not theoretically, not indulge in various intellectual arguments for and against, but when one is faced with this, is one to act taking sides, sides of the established order, whether it is a Communist established order, which is bureaucracy, the established order of the Capitalist, and so on, or the religious group? Or is one to revolt against all this, as so many people are doing? The expression of revolt varies in different countries. Drug taking is a form of that revolt. The revolt of black and white in America, anti-war, pro-war, the explosion of population right throughout the world, the undeveloped countries. And has revolt any meaning at all? And to act is necessary; to do something. Either one does, or responds adequately, to the fragment of a particular breakdown, taking the political issue and throwing oneself into it, or the economic issue, or the social work, or should one withdraw completely into one's own isolation, retire into a world of meditation, which is what is happening also. Surely all these are an indication, aren't they, of approaching the problem fragmentarily? This is a human problem - as a whole, not of a particular group or a particular people, or of a particular culture.

Can one respond to this, totally, as a whole phenomenon, not a particular kind of phenomena? And is it possible to respond to this with our whole mind and heart, so that we act not in fragments but as a whole being? And I feel that's the only possible response and the only possible action, confronted, as we are, with this phenomenon of degeneration. After all, degeneration takes place when one knows what to do and not to do it. And do we know what to do? Not what to do with regard to a particular fragment, but what to do with regard to the whole structure and nature of our society and of ourselves? I don't know if you have thought about this, or if you are interested in this kind of approach. Because the house is burning - not your house or my house, but the house that man has built for millennia. Where there is so much sorrow, illusion, where there is no faith in anything - quite rightly. How is one to respond to all this? Shall one invent a new ideal, a principle, a directive? Because the old ideals, the old directives, the old moralities completely failed. So in reaction to that, one can have or intellectually conjure up a marvellous ideal; a new utopia, and work for that. And is that the answer? An ideal, a new principle? When the old ideals and old principles have completely failed? And mustn't all ideals, always fail? Because they're not real; they're just the opposite of what actually is. So can one discard all ideals? And if you do, can you live without a directive? Ideals at least give a certain directive, and one can lay the course of one's life along that. But the ideals, as in the past, have really no meaning whatsoever, when one examines it very closely. So if you have no directive - and apparently human beings at the present state have no directive - they are driven by various issues, and being driven

by propaganda, by certain structure of a particular society and culture in a certain direction. It's not directive at all; it's just acting out of confusion. This is really a very serious question.

Philosophies have failed; philosophies have no meaning, they are just theories. And you can't twist man's arm or his mind to fit into a particular philosophy. This phenomena we can see very well all over the world. So, one asks what is it that you, as a human being, can do? If you're at all alive, if you're at all aware of this thing that is happening in the world? Go to Nepal, India, to find a new teacher, learn to meditate, sit cross-legged and renounce the world, to find God, Jesus, and all the rest of it? Or join a new religion, a new philosophy of ideals? Take to drugs? All these, surely, are not the answer. Or do you sit back and look at it all and say, well I can't do anything. What can I do, I, a single human being against this mass of corruption, violence and disgrace, immorality, what can I do? When you put such a question, it is the wrong question. Because we, as a human being, as an individual, are part of this mess. We have contributed to this, we are responsible for this, and to be indifferent to it is to watch one's own house burning, which means one must be extraordinarily insensitive, indifferent, callous. So what is one to do? If you are faced with that question - please do listen to this - if you are faced with this question and there is no one to tell you because the teachers, the gurus, the priests, the philosophers, the educators, the politicians, have completely failed, you cannot possibly put your faith in another, or turn to some authority, because we have tried all that and they've all collapsed. So when you are driven into a corner, as you must be if you are at all alive, and not completely

dead, you have to find an answer, knowing that you cannot possibly rely on anybody, no new guru, new teacher, new philosophy, new ideals. So you are faced with yourself, who is part of this world, part of this degeneration. How do you then respond? Being driven into a corner, seeing actually what is taking place, your own house burning, how will you act?

Can one rely on one's own intelligence, on one's own understanding, on one's own experience, knowledge? The experience, the knowledge, the understanding, are they not also conditioned, by the society, by the culture in which one lives? And can one rely on that conditioning? Has not this conditioning produced this chaos in the world? You understand what is implied in all this? If you cannot possibly rely on outside agency, because that led to wars, brutality, bureaucracy - if you cannot rely on outside agency can you rely on yourself? Yourself, are you strong enough, clear enough, unconfused; seeing the whole thing, not just little patches of it? And, ourselves, each one, is so fragile; we haven't got intelligence enough; there's no vital demand to find out. So, what is one to do? Despair? Live only for the present; enjoy oneself? Just let things go? You understand the issue? You cannot rely on outside, you can't rely on yourself. Your self is the result of the outside world in which you have lived and which you have created. The society is you and you are the society; the two are not separate. If you reject that you reject also this, and you must. So what is it that is rejecting? Are you following this? When you reject the outside world, the outside authority, the priest, the church, the whole structure, are you not also rejecting yourself, throwing it away? Because that which is outside of you is part of

you. You're Christian, Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist, Hindu, Communist, this or that, you're conditioned and when you reject that you must also reject your own conditioning. And can one be free of one's conditioning? Not partly, in patches here and there, but entirely, completely, wholly, both the conscious as well as the unconscious. After all, that is freedom. And it is only in that freedom that there is right action; total action, which will respond wholly to this vast phenomena.

So that is the issue: to free the mind. The mind, not your mind or my mind, but the mind of man - which is you - from all his conditioning. Can one attack the problem that way? Because otherwise we are not free and because we are not free there is chaos in the world. And freedom is this absolute unconditioning the mind. And if we don't we shall always live in prison, decorated more or less, become great technicians, go to the moon and further, put the flag on Venus, or the cross on Mars, or the red flag somewhere else and so on. We will always be in sorrow, in confusion.

From this arises whether it is intrinsic or inherent for part of the mind to be conditioned. What we are has been developed through thousands and thousands and millions of years, from the animal - up or down, as you prefer. And the brain, the human brain is conditioned to survive and it must survive otherwise there is destruction, and the survival now is dependent on psychological movement which is also conditioned. So can one be aware of this conditioning, at all the levels of our consciousness not just on the superficial level, deep down, in the innermost recesses of one's mind, and free it, and dissolve this conditioning, the conditioning

of violence, hate, jealousy, ambition, greed; the division between you and me, we and they? The tradition, the memories, the thousand years of propaganda, the conditioning which divides man against man?

So can one become so totally aware that one sees one's conditioning and dissolves it? Not during the course of many years, because if you allow time, many years, in that concession to time there are other factors entering into that field, other pressures and strains which prevent you from dissolving the conditioning. So you cannot possibly rely on time, on evolution, therefore it must be done instantly, immediately. I do not know if you follow all this, if it has any meaning at all. When the house is burning you don't sit back and say, 'Who set it on fire?', the you, the old age, the old tradition, discuss the length of hair of the man who must have set it on fire and so on and so on and so on. You act. In the same way, becoming aware of this conditioning, one must act instantly. The incapacity to act instantly is degeneration. And that is what is happening in the world. Knowing one is conditioned, and not being aware of it, and carrying on. Or being aware of it and not doing anything about it. After all, one of our conditionings is, basically, psychological fear - not only physical fears, but deep, inward fears, of solitude, of loneliness, of not being loved, of having nothing, the sense of frustration, the inward fears. We have them and we abide with them. We put up with them because we don't know what to do. We take to drink, or go to church, or become philosophers or something else, but there they are. Can we, knowing these fears, dissolve them instantly? And to put aside completely fear one needs energy, great energy. And this energy is dissipated, wasted

when there is any form of resistance to fear. Please, I'm going into it a little bit - I hope you don't mind - because we have to go into it thoroughly or not at all.

Any form of resistance to fear - escaping, trying to conquer it, trying to forget it, or even accepting it and living with it - is a wastage of energy. So can we not escape, not try to suppress it, control it, but give all our attention to it, with our hearts and with our minds completely, then you will see the conflict between the desire to overcome the fear, or resisting fear, disappears entirely. If one is able not only to face it, to be fully acquainted with it, to learn all about it, to learn what it is, but to observe it, there must be no observer because the observer who is separate from the thing he observes, which he calls fear, the observer himself is fear. So, can one observe, watch, this fear without the observer who resists, who tries to overcome it, tries to understand it, tries to analyse it, dissipate it, conquer it? Then when one observes it, in that sense, when there is no division between the observer and the observed, then is there fear at all? Surely there is only fear when there is the observer who separates himself from the fear.

So, if you say that it's not possible for the mind to be unconditioned, ever, as many do, then you have no problem, then you carry on as you are. But if you investigate, explore freely, as one must, confronted with this madness that's going on in the world, then it's not a question of possibility or impossibility but investigation - not analysis, because analysis implies time; the cause and the effect and so on, and on. And when you analyse there is also division between the analyser and the thing analysed. But the analyser is part of the analysis, is the thing analysed; the

two are not separate. So you have this outward phenomenon which is the inward phenomenon. The inward state is the outward state, which is not just a theory but it's an actuality. We have created this society, organised it, until the human being radically changes, deep down in his psyche, we will create organisation and bureaucracies, perhaps modified from what they are now, but they'll be the same, until we come down to something very basic, fundamental, which is whether the human mind - the mind that you and I have is the result of a million years, therefore it's not personal mind. It's the whole content of history, of all the struggles and experience of man. And that mind is conditioned, and the only answer to this challenge of deterioration is complete freedom from this conditioning, and in that there's complete action, not inadequate action. Now, can we discuss this? Can we go into it together?

You know that word, 'communication' - it's very important to understand. Communication means building together, creating together. The word itself means that. And here we are trying to communicate, the speaker is trying to communicate with you, who are the listener, which means the listener and the speaker are creating together. Therefore, you're not sitting back and listening, to a few words, or a few ideas because it is not a question of ideas - we are together building, together creating sufficient energy to break down this conditioning. Together. It cannot be done by yourself in a little corner, because you cannot possibly live by yourself; you are in communication with the world, whether it's with one person or with a dozen persons, or a thousand persons. Therefore relationship means communication; relationship means building together. I don't know if you're following all this. See the

beauty of it.

Questioner: Building together also conditions.

K: No. I'm just using that. First see, I'm talking about the word 'communication', not conditioning. We'll come to that. I don't know if I understand you rightly, I am talking - we are talking about that word, 'communication', which means, as I said, to build together. Here, communication means building together, understanding together, working together. Not you and I working separately. In mechanical, technical things people do communicate with each other extraordinarily well. I believe three-hundred thousand men were needed to build the rocket, or whatever it's called, to go to the moon. They co-operated, every part had to be perfect to make it work. Technologically, apparently, we can co-operate - and that's all. We cannot co-operate, build together, psychologically, inwardly. That's only possible when you and I have no ideals, no opinions, no commitments, and look at the whole phenomenon together. I don't know if you follow all this. If you see this phenomenon that's going on in the world from your own particular prejudice, from your own particular belief, or your own particular knowledge, and I with my own knowledge and belief, and so on, how can we communicate? How can we build together? It's impossible. It's only possible to build together, to co-operate together, when you and I are free of prejudice; good or bad. And that is why communication is so important.

Q: But who is rejecting what? Who is free?

K: Who is free, are you asking?

Q: Yes.

K: Is that the question, sir? 'Who is free?' Or, freedom is only a

movement of life when there is no conditioning. Not who is free. It's not that I am free and you're not, or you're free and I'm not, but when the human mind, like yours or mine, understands this, and shatters the conditioning. And to shatter the conditioning is will necessary? Do you follow? Is will necessary, is a decision necessary? Or the observer communes, or communicates with the thing observed. You follow? To communicate there must be no separation. You follow? If you remain a Christian, or a Socialist, Communist, whatever it is, and I remain a Hindu with my ugliness and all the rest of that, how can we possibly communicate? There's communication only if there is freedom.

Q: Is it possible when one has reached the state of freedom to communicate with one who is not free?

K: Is it possible, when one ... Listen to it! Do you understand what freedom is, and that movement of freedom in you, in ...

Q: To collaborate.

K: Wait. Same thing, collaborate. Can your mind, free, collaborate with me who is stupid, not free? Can you communicate with me? With my prejudices, with my ambitions, greed, angers, hatred? Obviously not. So see the difficulty of this, sir. So, you'll say, how am I to change the world then? If there are only a few with whom I can communicate, and the whole rest of the world is too ... whatever it is, how can we change the world, right? That's one of the questions, sir, 'how can we change the world?' I think that's the wrong question to put altogether. Then you are thinking in terms of organisation, which soon become bureaucratic and all the rest of it. Organisation are necessary; they are intrinsically degenerating all the time, organisation. And those who are

bureaucratically Western in the organisation, want to hold it. How can you communicate with such people?

Q: But they are saying the same thing. The problem is, it's visa versa.

K: I don't quite understand.

Q: I think I'm free.

K: Ah! No. There's no question of thinking that you are free. Thought, sir, thought can never be free.

Q: Well, I feel I am free.

K: Ah, you cannot say that. The moment you say, 'I am free', you are not! Do see this, please. The verb, 'to be' implies to have and to have, to possess, makes you say, 'I am'. I am God, I am this, I am that. But you are not. You are a movement, living. Therefore there is never a moment when you can say, 'I am'.

Q: So, how can one build something in this society, already built?

K: Do watch, sir. Look at your words! 'How can we build in this society?'

Q: Already built.

K: Already built. Either you break it down and build a new one; watch it, sir. And the breaking down of it is by those people who are conditioned, who will create another society which will be similar or perhaps modified, or somewhat tyrannical, or less tyrannical. It'll be the same pattern. And this has been tried. Not just only in this generation, or the past generation, this has been tried thousands of times. So, society inevitably is in corruption, all the time. Right? It is. It doesn't matter which society. So, a free man can work there, surely. He doesn't have to leave the world, but

yet not belong to it, and that's where we begin to deceive ourselves. That's where we begin to play the hypocrite: I belong to it and yet I don't belong to it. But not to be a hypocrite one has to be free inwardly, very deeply; testing it out, not just saying, 'I am free' - that means nothing.

So you are saying, aren't you, in other words, a free man cannot live in this world. Right? A free man, either you set him on a pedestal and worship him, or kick him down in the gutter, and he can't live. Why not? A sane man, you know, an intelligent man, a man who is not angry, jealous, all the rest of it - can't he live in this world, knowing that this society, whatever society it is, always in corruption? If he cannot live in this society, you are asking the most impossible question. If he cannot live in this society, whatever the society, whatever the culture, he's not free. Yes, sir. If he's not free, he will belong to this society, if he's free he can live in this society. Then it is something entirely different. Then his relationship to the world is entirely different. He doesn't belong to it because he's no longer, etc., all the greed, ambition, envy and all that, no race, no cast, nothing of that stupid stuff. Being free then, he can live in this world and it is only the free man that can do it.

Q: He's also a very sad man.

K: Sad?

Q: Yes, because he sees ...

K: Oh, sir. If you don't see the sunset and I do see the beauty of the sunset, am I sad because you don't see it? I talk with you; I communicate with you, but if you refuse to see it, what am I to do? I am not sad. Why should I be sad? Look, sir, there is so much suffering in the world. One has shed so many tears, which is not

emotional - we're talking of facts not sentiment. There's great sorrow in the world; the Christian world worships sorrow, because they don't know what to do with it, they don't know how to end it. And the man who may end it and say, I'm not in sorrow, how can he communicate that feeling of non-sorrowness (if I can use that word!) to somebody who is in sorrow? Either he throws a brick at him, saying you are a callous brute because you don't feel what I feel about it, or you worship him or you leave him alone as a kind of strange human entity. It's only the man who is free from sorrow can walk with sorrow. You don't see it. That's after all his innocency - that word innocence means 'not to be hurt', 'not to be able to be hurt', which means no resistance. And the innocent man can live in this world and he's the only man who can live in this world without being made corrupt by it.

Now, sirs, you've heard all of this; what are you going to do? Go back to your psychological field? In one corner of that field live, dig in and say, well, I can't do anything; bear the burden of your own life and sorrow and confusion. One can everlastingly play with words, with ideas, with theories. That's what we have done. We're a slave to words and we're frightened to live without the word. The word, 'me' has become extraordinarily important - the I, the ego - but when you look at the meaning behind that word, there is nothing in it except the me who possesses a piece of furniture. That's all. So the furniture becomes extraordinarily important, not me. And that's one of our difficulties, perhaps the major difficulty - to be free of the word. The word 'love' isn't love, but we're satisfied with the word. When you put away the word, what is love? Not what we would like it to be, what actually it is?

Love in which there is so much anger, jealousy, envy, possessiveness, domination, the conflict between you and me. In that there is so much pleasure, desire, sexual pleasure, the repetition of that sexual pleasure which is called love, and therefore fear, anger - is all that love? And yet we are satisfied by that word; we live on that word. And that word is associated with sex, or that word is associated with God; 'love God and everything will be all right'. So, the mind is a slave to words; the mind is conditioned by the word, and one cannot uncondition the mind, first the word, then another layer, bit by bit by bit - that's a hopeless game. It must be done with a single glance and that's why it matters immensely how you look at yourself, with what eyes. If it's the eye of condemnation, judgement, evaluation, then you are not looking at all. You might say, well I don't want to look at myself because I'm so ugly - that very word is preventing you from looking. You've already come with a conclusion which prevents you from looking. So, to be aware of that conclusion and be free of that conclusion, then you can look. After all, we have based all our looks and our attitudes, our values, our images put together by the mind, words. You mean to say, we can't put aside all those images, and look?

Q: Do you feel that freedom and love are the same thing?

K: We must both understand the word 'freedom' and 'love'. If I say yes, then you might have quite a different meaning to it. Therefore we must establish communication first.

Q: Well, I believe you said the mind is free, one does not have prejudice and one has ...

K: What? The other way round. There is no freedom as long as

there is prejudice.

Q: All right.

K: No, sir. Not 'all right'. First, see how prejudice - whether good prejudice or bad prejudice, experienced prejudice, or casual prejudice, prejudice - prevents communication and therefore there is no freedom. Your prejudice or my prejudice. So freedom is a movement in which there is no prejudice.

Q: All right. Is love a movement in which there is no prejudice?

K: Obviously, sir. Obviously love means ... Sir, look at it. Is love pleasure?

Q: To me?

K: En general! Is love pleasure? If it is, then in pleasure is there not pain? And if there is pleasure there must be pain and therefore there is fear. So is love fear, pain and pleasure? Or is it nothing whatsoever to do with that?

Q: Well, I would agree with all that. I'm just trying to find out the things that freedom and love both have in common.

K: Yes, sir, you can say that, but it's the same movement, if we don't divide it as love and freedom and goodness and beauty - it's all one movement.

Q: Can I just stop you there? Freedom and love both exist when the mind is free from prejudice.

K: No, it's much more than this.

Q: I know it is, but ...

K: Quite.

Q: So, in order to get to that point, then one must be aware.

K: That's right, sir.

Q: All right.

K: So, one must also enquire what awareness means. How can one be aware if you are condemning something.

Q: Will you give me an example of how one cannot be aware that one is obsessed with fear.

K: That's right, sir. So, one has to become aware of fear and the awareness of fear, it's possible to dissipate it only when there is non-duality - the observer and the observed and so on and on.

Q: Well, this, to me, is a phenomenon which has occurred in only a few of us and I - and when I say 'I', I don't mean one in possession of a chair - I feel that, as you said, in order for the human mind, which is not my mind, your mind, but our collective mind, to have come to this point it all transpires what you said was evolution, either up or down, from the animals and to 'me', again in quotes, the only way that you can reverse this process is either - well, two ways - either by de-evolution, taking us all back to the form in which we started, or in an instant the observer and the observed can become the same.

K: Sir, you are putting it in a different way. You see you can't go down to the animals.

Q: You gave that somewhere earlier.

K: Ah, no. I said, jokingly, either one can go up or down. That was a humorous statement, one cannot really. There's no going down. You can go down if you want to - if one wants to go down and become a complete animal, it is possible.

Q: I just don't want to stay here. I don't care if I go up, down, either way. I mean no disrespect, it's just that I'm trying in my attempt to communicate, it's necessary that 'I' understand. So that I can be aware.

K: Yes. You know, if I may suggest, or say, to spend an hour or two like this has very little meaning unless you do it; unless you observe yourself with tremendous attention. And if you observe yourself with that attention I assure you the thing will begin to completely change, because after all the mind that each one has is the result of the whole human growth; you are the history, you are the past, you are the whole of humanity although you have divided yourself into Christian and Buddhist and this and that. You are the whole of this world. And there it is, inside you, and you don't have to have read a single philosophical book or psychology - it's all there. Personally I've never read a book about all these things, but one can look, one can listen to the world, what is going on and one can listen inwardly to what is going on. Wisdom can't be bought in a book. Nor is it a matter of tradition? Someone can't give it to you, it's part of intelligence, wisdom. And to be intelligent in the greatest sense of that word, you need to be highly sensitive, not through drugs but through awareness, through watching, listening, the mind becomes extraordinarily awake.

Shall we talk a little bit about meditation? Shall we? What do you think we have been doing during this hour? That's part of meditation. You know, to observe one needs a very quiet, still mind. If your mind is chattering, occupied, worried, anxious, guilty, you cannot observe, can you? You cannot see the tree, the cloud, your friend, or anything. And to have this silent mind, to come upon this silent mind, which is not a status, that is still a movement, surely the chattering must come to an end. And it cannot be forced. You cannot say to the mind, 'Ah, keep quiet' - it can't. So you have to understand the whole process of chattering,

thinking, you follow? The place of thought, what is its value. It has immense value, logical, sane, healthy, in certain parts of the field, but not at all in others. Because thought is never free; thought is the response of memory, memory is the past. So thought at no time is free. And thought is necessary to function in the technological field of daily living, moment to moment, you have to think, otherwise you couldn't get home. But to observe, if you observe through the screen of thought, you don't see at all. Then you are looking at the present through the past. Therefore you don't see the present. Now, to really communicate that with you, that means both of us see together that the past completely prevents the present, and we live in the past - our whole structure of thought is based on the past. And when the mind tries to look at the present, at the beauty of it, the movement of it, how can the dead past look at it? That's why any conclusion, good or bad, any ideal, in the future - an ideal is always in the future - if you have those ideals obviously you can't look. So you can't look, there's no observation, if there is the weight of the past, or the attraction of the future. Now you hear that, which is a fact, logical, healthy, sane, not abnormal or neurotic. Can you drop the past? The past being the tradition, the memory, the hurts, all that - drop and look? You can if the thing becomes extraordinarily important. If the past is of tremendous danger, then you pull away, you run away from it. The past is you, your memories, your hurts. That's why to observe all this in oneself without any compulsion, without any condemnation, just to watch - and in that there is great beauty - there are no tears in it; no despair. Is that enough?

Q: When you say, 'Is that enough?' - you should know whether

that's enough, or not.

K: Ha! I can get up and go. Don't take that seriously!